

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

NO. XXXVI....DECEMBER, 1844.

## ARTICLE I.

### INFANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

BY THE EDITOR.

[CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 466.]

INFANT CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP ; *or the Relation of Baptized Children to the Church.* By WILLIAM A. STEARNS. Boston. Crocker & Brewster. 165 pp. 12mo. 1844.

#### §1. *The argument from our Saviour's treatment of children.*

IN the second section of his first chapter, Mr. S. endeavors to sustain the doctrine of infant church-membership "from our Saviour's treatment of children in reference to his church and kingdom." A fallacy meets us, however, at the beginning. There is an element of error in the bare question, What was our Saviour's treatment of children in reference to his church? It seems to imply that he held them as, in some manner, related to the church. It is put as if he treated them, in some way, in virtue of his recognition of such a relation, as he would not have treated them if he had not recognized the existence of such a relation. But the evidence that those who brought them were believers, is merely conjectural, or, at the best, only circumstantial. Parental anxiety, mingled with an indefinite impression of the dignity and power of Christ, might have prompted unconverted persons, of a tender and susceptible spirit, to

bring their children to him for his blessing, as to a wonderful and revered man. The ancient Jews were accustomed to seek the blessing of prophets and holy men for their children; and when these persons prayed for the children, it was common to place their hands upon the heads of those for whom they prayed. The evidence that in what our Saviour did to them, he designed to treat them in any way in reference to their acknowledged connection with the church, is still more obscure and far-fetched. What did he do to them, or say of them, which he might not have done precisely in the same manner, if they had been, as perhaps they were, the children of unbelieving parents? Our Lord, indeed, expressed an affectionate interest in them. He took them up in his arms and blessed them. But how these things had any reference to the church, which is a spiritual organization of believers, we are unable to see.

In his discussion on this part of the subject, Mr. S. quotes Matt. 19: 14. "But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Of this passage, he says, "There is especially one passage which bears upon the subject of infant church-membership with great force, and is therefore entitled to careful examination." Olshausen, on this passage (I, 721), has a remark which may not have come to the knowledge of Mr. S. He says, "Of the reference to infant baptism, often sought in this narrative, manifestly not a trace is to be seen."

In commenting on the passage, Mr. S. expresses the opinion, as we have already remarked, that the phrase, *kingdom of heaven*, does not generally imply *heaven*, in the common acceptation of the term; but the kingdom which Christ came to establish on earth, and which "consists of a mixed community, foolish virgins among the wise, tares among the wheat, good and bad in the same net. . . The only visible presentation of it is the church." We do not deny that this interpretation may, in some passages, be the true one. But we have been surprised that our author should propose it, with reference to its application here. Let us make the substitution of terms in the passage: Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me; for of such is the mixed community of bad and good, tares and wheat, etc. Or, as Dr. Woods explains the verb involving the relation of possession,—to such belongs the mixed



community, etc. If we use the term "church," instead of "mixed community, etc.," with the recollection of the spirituality of character, and holiness of habit in its constituent members, which that term, in New Testament language, implies, it is but little better:—Of such is the church; to such belongs the church; or, adopting the explanation of τῶν τοιούτων, given both by Mr. S. and Dr. Woods,—to these, and such as these, belongs the church; or these, and such as are like them, are fit members of the church. What church? we ask. A spiritual, New Testament church?—or, a mixed community, etc.?

But we cannot assent to the view of Mr. S., that the church is "the visible presentation" of a kingdom containing "some unworthy, uninvited members," and others, "properly belonging to it." If such a heterogeneous mixture is, by divine appointment, the kingdom of heaven, whatever that kingdom be, and the church is, by divine appointment, its visible presentation, then the church must be, by divine appointment, constituted like that which it symbolizes,—partly of good, and partly of wicked persons; partly of the regenerate and holy, and partly of the unregenerate. Neither do we think that our author himself adheres to this definition of the term *church*. If he should, we see not but the very thing contended for falls to the ground of itself. The children who by baptism are brought into the church, are no otherwise situated than the children, who, being unbaptized, are out of the church. For as the church, in this view, embraces within its bosom, confessedly, a portion of the ungodly world, the baptized children, unless they became regenerate either before, or in the moment of their baptism, must belong to the world within the church, instead of belonging to the world without the church. And as it is, in either case, the world, the unholy, whom God does not own as his people, nor bind himself to be their God, as distinguished from those who are "called to be saints," their condition is, in no wise, improved. In their relations to God and pious persons, their claim upon the promises, and the blessings of God's covenant with his people, and their prospect of heaven, they are precisely on a footing with those who, by the omission of baptism, or by reason of the impiety of their parents, are supposed to be outcasts from the covenant, and rejected from visible union

with God. But it was the object of our author to prove the opposite of this. Hence we infer that he does not himself adhere to such a definition of the church. He uses it to signify the true people of God, the regenerate, the holy, the heirs of heaven.

But that a church, on the New Testament model, cannot be built of such ill-assorted materials, we think sufficiently evident. On this point New England has experimented once to her sorrow. The evils of it, though not fully apprehended so early as the days of Pres. Edwards, already began to be felt, and called out his energies to stem the tide of corruption which this theory had begun to pour over the garden of the Lord. We are delighted with the clearness with which he exposed the several errors included in the theory of church-membership, which our author's system forces him to entertain. He saw that a church, on the New Testament model, is a society of believers, and that it can embrace no others. Whatever unscriptural views he might have held concerning the ecclesiastical condition of baptized infants, he clearly saw, that there could not be two sorts of church-membership, by virtue of which, some should be introduced to the church on one ground, and others on another. He saw that the church, properly speaking, could not consist merely of a smaller body within the larger body of the church visible; while a part of the visible church which embraces the true church, belongs to the world of the ungodly. Such an *ἐκκλησία ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*, could he have conceived it, would have obviated all the difficulty he felt in the sacramental controversy, which cost him his settlement at Northampton. He saw, moreover, another point, which his brethren of the same faith, in later ages, have overlooked, to wit, that baptism is the proper act of intelligent persons, implying the believer's dying to sin, and rising again to newness of life. On these matters, his statements are so much to the point, that we take the liberty to quote his own words.

“Baptism, by which the primitive converts were admitted into the church, was used as an exhibition and token of their being visibly ‘regenerated, dead to sin, alive to God, having the old man crucified, being delivered from the reigning power of sin, being made free from sin, and become the servants of righteousness, those servants of God that have their fruit unto that holiness whose end is everlasting life;’ as is evident by Rom. 6, throughout. In the former part of the

chapter, he speaks of the Christian Romans, as 'dead to sin, being buried with Christ in baptism, having their old man crucified with Christ,' etc. He does not mean only, that their baptism laid them under special obligations to these things, and was a mark and token of their engagement to be thus hereafter, but was designed as a mark, token, and exhibition, of their being visibly thus already."

The same is stated elsewhere in another form, but in a manner quite as satisfactory.

"There are some duties of worship. that imply a profession of God's covenant; whose very nature and design is an exhibition of those vital, active principles and inward exercises, wherein consists the condition of the covenant of grace, or that union of soul to God, which is the union between Christ and his spouse, entered into by an inward, hearty consenting to that covenant. Such are the Christian sacraments, whose very design is to make and confirm a profession of compliance with that covenant, and whose very nature is to exhibit or express the uniting acts of the soul. Those sacramental duties, therefore, cannot be attended by any whose hearts do not really consent to that covenant, and whose souls do not truly close with Christ, without either their being self-deceived, or else wilfully making a false profession, and lying in a very aggravated manner."

In the same treatise, he speaks of the unscriptural union of believers and unbelievers in church-relationship, forming the absurdity of which we spoke, of a church within a church. The remarks of President Edwards were made with reference to the communion of adult persons, supposed to be unregenerate, with true believers, in the same church. They have, however, equal force in the case before us; inasmuch as the children, introduced to the church in their infancy, in most cases soon become unbelieving adults.

"In a word, the practice of promiscuous admission,—or that way of taking all into the church indifferently as visible saints, who are not either ignorant or scandalous,—and at the same time that custom taking place of persons publishing their own conversion in common conversation, where these two things meet together, they unavoidably make two distinct kinds of visible churches, or different bodies of professing saints, one within another, openly distinguished one from another, as it were, by a visible dividing line,—one company consisting of those who are visibly gracious Christians, and open professors of godliness; another, consisting of those who are visibly moral livers, and only profess common virtues, without pretending to any special and spiritual experiences in their hearts, and who, therefore, are not reputed to be converts. I may appeal to those acquainted with the state of the churches, whether this be not actually the case in some, where this method of proceeding has been long established. But I leave the judicious reader to make his own remarks on this case, and to determine, whether there be a just foundation in Scripture or reason, for any such state of things; which to me, I confess, carries the face of glaring absurdity."



President Edwards shows, in an extended and most satisfactory manner, that the New Testament churches were composed only of saints. He examines the character of each church, and the quality of its constituents, as they may be inferred from the manner in which they were formed, and the mode in which they are addressed. We quote a few only of his remarks.

"We have an account concerning these, of their being first awakened by the preaching of the apostles and other ministers, and earnestly inquiring what they should do to be saved; and of their being directed to repent and believe on the Lord Jesus, as the way to have their sins blotted out, and to be saved; and then, upon their professing that they did believe, of their being baptized and admitted into the Christian church.

\* \* \* \* "These things evidently show how all the Christian churches through the world were constituted in those days, and what sort of saintship it was, that all visible Christians in good standing had a visibility and profession of, in that apostolic age; and also what sort of visibility of this they had, viz., not only that which gave them right to a kind of negative charity or freedom from censure, but that which might justly induce a positive judgment in their favor." \* \* \* \*

"If we should suppose, that, by reason of the extraordinary state of things in that day, the apostles had reason to think the greater part of the members of churches to be true Christians; yet, unless profession and appearance of true Christianity was their proper qualification and the ground of their admission, and unless it was supposed that all of them esteemed themselves true Christians, it is altogether unaccountable that the apostles, in their epistles to them, never make any express, particular distinction between those different sorts of members.

"If the churches were made up of persons who looked on themselves in so different a state—some the children of God, and others the children of the devil, some the high favorites of Heaven and heirs of eternal glory, others the children of wrath, being under condemnation to eternal death, and every moment in danger of dropping into hell—why do the apostles make no distinction in their manner of addressing them, and in the counsels, reproofs and warnings they gave them? Why do they never direct their speech to the unconverted members of churches, in particular, in a manner tending to awaken them, and make them sensible of the miserable condition they were in, and press them to seek the converting grace of God? It is to be considered, that the apostle Paul was very particularly acquainted with the circumstances of most of those churches to whom he wrote; for he had been among them, was their spiritual father, had been the instrument of gathering and founding those churches, and they had received all their instructions and directions relating to Christianity and their souls' concerns from him; nor can it be questioned but that many of them had opened the case of their souls to him. And if he was sensible that there was a number among them who made no pretensions to a regenerate state, and that none had reason to judge them to be in such a state, he knew that the sin of such—who lived in the rejection of a Saviour, even in the very house of God, in the midst of gospel-light, and in violation of



the most sacred vows—was peculiarly aggravated, and their guilt and state peculiarly dreadful. Why should he therefore never particularly and distinctly point his addresses to such, applying himself to them in much compassion to their souls, and putting them in mind of their awful circumstances? But instead of this, we observe him continually lumping all together, and indifferently addressing the whole body, as if they were all in happy circumstances, expressing his charity for them all, and congratulating them all in their glorious and eternal privilege. Instead of speaking to them in such a manner as should have a tendency to alarm them with a sense of danger, we see him, on the contrary, calling on all without distinction to rejoice. Phil. 3: 1. 'Finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord.' So 2 Cor. 13: 2. 'Finally, brethren, be of good comfort.' Phil. 4: 4. Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice.' The matter is insisted upon, as though rejoicing were a duty especially proper for them, and what they had the highest reason for. The apostle not only did not preach terror to those to whom he wrote, but is careful to guard them against fears of God's wrath. In 1 Thess. 5, at the beginning, the apostle observes, how that Christ will come on ungodly men as 'a thief in the night; and when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction shall come upon them, as travail on a woman with child, and they shall not escape;' then immediately he uses caution, that members of the church at Thessalonica should not take this to themselves, and be terrified, as though they were in danger, and says, in the next words, 'But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief; ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day.' Vs. 9—11. 'For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him. Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another; even as also ye do.' And v. 16, Rejoice evermore.' How diverse is this way of treating churches, from the method in which faithful ministers are wont to deal with their congregations, wherein are many that make no pretence to true piety, and from the way in which Mr. Stoddard was wont to deal with his congregation. And how would he have undoubtedly judged such a way of treating them the most direct course in the world eternally to undo them! And shall we determine that the apostle Paul was one of those prophets who daubed with untempered mortar, and sewed pillows under all arm-holes, and healed the hurt of immortal souls slightly, crying Peace, peace, when there was no peace?"

Such is a church on the New Testament model. How it could embrace unconverted children, and baptized children, grown up to be ungodly adults, and hold them tenaciously in its sacred fellowship, we do not see. If a church admit such a mixture, of what use would be the corrective discipline of the body? It could neither be wisely and efficiently begun nor carried through, unless by the immediate and formal excision of those who had been formally admitted in acknowledged unregeneracy, and by declining ever to receive another who did not approve himself

a worthy member, by a voluntary profession of his faith in Christ, and newness of life.

Having finished his remarks on the nature of the kingdom of Christ, Mr. S. proceeds to show that our Saviour designed to include the infants brought to him for his blessing, as fit members. This view he sustains by four reasons. The first is stated as follows: "It can hardly be supposed that those who resemble such children are entitled to membership *because of that resemblance*, while the children themselves whom they resemble are excluded." He says also, that, "under all the circumstances, such a mode of speaking would be peculiarly liable to mislead, and should not be attributed to the Saviour without sufficient reason." But our author's position, most evidently, lies open to criticism. If it be admitted, it will necessarily involve consequences from which every evangelical theologian must recoil. In saying that the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as resemble the little children brought to him for his blessing, our Saviour must have designed to speak either of a partial resemblance, or a universal one. It is the office of the critic to discover which is the more probable; and, if only a partial resemblance was designed, in what respects it is to be sought. If exact, universal resemblance were meant, then we are conducted to the interpretation, that the kingdom of heaven properly belongs to very young children only. Or, if merely a moral resemblance be implied, then it follows that the kingdom of heaven properly belongs to those who are throughout, in moral respects, like infant children. But as the youngest children, by their constitution, have, confessedly, a depraved and unregenerate nature, this view would commit our Saviour to the absurdity of saying that the kingdom of heaven properly belongs to the unregenerate and depraved. If a partial resemblance only were meant, then it is reasonable to say that the kingdom of heaven, and heaven itself, belongs to those who resemble little children in one or two particulars, though they may be unlike them in all others. This we believe to be our Saviour's meaning. He designed to teach that the kingdom of heaven belongs to those who resemble little children in trustfulness, in humility, and in freedom from actual sin; in a guileless spirit, in tenderness, and in absence of ambition. They may be very unlike them in many other points; but it is likeness in these, which constitutes their

claim. On account of the presence of those qualities as mere instincts in the little ones brought to our Saviour, he was moved with affection for them and blessed them. But when, on growing up, the children should lose those endearing qualities by contact with a wicked world, and by the development of their own depravity, the same that were thus clasped to the bosom of the Saviour, and his words of blessing pronounced upon them, might be, by the same Saviour, rejected as unconverted persons. If the children were as young as the argument and the circumstances seem to demand, they could not have possessed these qualities, as moral qualities, but only as instincts.

This is perfectly intelligible. And hence, our Saviour's mode of speaking is not justly chargeable with a liability to mislead even a cursory reader. It is, moreover, a consideration of some importance, that the spirit of the requirement does not demand precisely the same affection, under the same circumstances and relations, exercised in the same manner, springing from the same source, manifested by the same outward exhibitions, and tending to the same ends. This would be evidently impossible, owing to the difference in the subjects in whom the affection subsists. The demand is that the affection resemble that of little children. "Except ye be converted, and become *as* little children, etc." The state of mind in the adult candidate for admission to Christ's kingdom, must be similar to that which exists in the little child—producing the same conduct, tending to the same fruits; and this similarity may appear, even though the affection be, in the one case, a mere instinct of childhood, disconnected from any regenerate qualities, and in the other the result of the operations of renewing grace.

The notion of a partial resemblance which we have just exhibited, Mr. S. himself presents afterwards, in commenting on Matt. 18: 3, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." He says,—

"By conversion, in this place, we are not to understand, spiritual birth; for, in that respect the disciples of Christ were converted already, but conversion from a particular state of mind, viz., from an ambitious desire of pre-eminence, to childlike humility. In this respect, it was essential for the disciples to become like children, in order to a worthy membership in Christ's kingdom."



We are surprised, however, to find him speaking of the children brought to our Saviour, as capable of the voluntary and intelligent exercise of religious affections; for if they had attained an age in which they were competent to such exercises, and actually exhibited them, they are not suitable examples of infant church-membership, and the case has no relation to his argument. He says, "How did these children receive the kingdom of heaven, as its privileges were conferred on them by the Saviour's words? Undoubtedly, with humility and trustful affection, without self-seeking or ambition. In this way adults must receive it, or not at all." He had before remarked that "these children, some of them at least, were infants." On this quotation we have also to observe, that it does not appear from the Scripture that Christ conferred by his words, upon the children whom he blessed, the privileges of the kingdom of heaven—neither the right of membership in the church, nor a claim to a seat in the heavenly mansions, nor any peculiar dignity or privilege pertaining to the Christian dispensation.

Our author's second reason for believing that Christ designed to include the children brought to him as fit members of his kingdom, is stated thus: "Our Saviour's *treatment* of these children implies a recognition of their title to membership in his kingdom." He proceeds to remark, that our Saviour was displeased, when the disciples rebuked those that brought the children, that he said, "Suffer the little children, etc.," and "by prayer and imposition of hands he signified to the by-standers, that these children, though some of them infants, and all of them, probably, very young, were yet capable of receiving, either immediately or prospectively, spiritual blessings. And not only so, but by an act of religious consecration, he hallowed and blessed, and set them apart for himself, saying at the same time, *of such* is the kingdom of heaven."

But we are at a loss to discover in our Saviour's treatment of the children brought to him for his blessing, any thing that implies his recognition of their title to church-membership. He neither affirms nor intimates that they have any such right. He neither puts upon them the introductive symbol of membership, nor directs it to be put upon them by his disciples. What he said, he might as well have said, and what he did, he might as well have done, if there were not a



church on earth, and if there never should be any. They were brought to Christ, not for the sake of his recognizing their church relationship, but that he might bless them. He did that for which they were brought, and nothing more. In the words which he spake, he said nothing of church connection, but only urged permission for them to come, on account of their meek, trustful, loving spirit, in which they resembled those who shall inherit the kingdom of heaven. This characteristic touched his affectionate heart. And, as it seems to us, he treated them no otherwise than, in view of such instinctive traits of childhood, such a being would have treated any other infants. In speaking of the parallel passage in Luke 18: 15, Mr. S. says, "these children thus received as members of his kingdom, etc." But if he would be understood to mean, thus received or recognized as members of the church, we ask, how they were received as members of the church? Indeed, as he gives us assertion only, on this point, and not proof, we may repel assertion with assertion. We may truly assert that Christ did not receive them as members of his church, because the New Testament gives us no such information.

The third reason assigned by our author seems to us equally unsound. He says, "the reason assigned by our Saviour for receiving these children, implies a recognition of membership in his kingdom. The reason is, because the kingdom of heaven is composed of such." We find ourselves here, as often elsewhere, perplexed by the author's use of the term *kingdom*, as being indefinite. But, in view of the point which he is endeavoring to defend, perhaps we should do him no wrong in supposing him, in all such cases, to mean *church*. In respect to the point itself, even if we grant that by the closing phrase our Saviour meant to say that the society of heaven is composed of such children, that would be a special reason why Christ should take them in his arms and bless them; and this the New Testament affirms. But why should we take it to be the ground of his recognizing the children as church-members, in respect to which, the Scripture affirms nothing at all?

His fourth reason for supposing that our Saviour designed, in this passage, to recognize the church-membership of the children brought to him for his blessing, is founded by our author on the use of the word *τοιούτων*, of *such*. He thinks

that "it implies both the persons compared, and those to whom they are compared,"—these children, and such as are like them. He supposes that the parents of the children were pious parents, and that they brought their infants in faith, to Christ, that he might bless them. On these two points he rests the church-membership of those whom our Saviour blessed, and in these two points of likeness, essentially, he places the right of other infants to the same privilege; to use his own words, "to all children of the same age and circumstances as the children in question, i. e., to all the infants and young children of believing parents, who bring their offspring in faith to Christ for his blessing." But the New Testament does not so much as inform us that it was the parents who brought them. And certainly, that the parents were believing parents, and that they brought their infants to Christ in faith, after the manner of believing parents in Pædobaptist churches at the present day, seems to us a gratuitous assumption. We see quite as much ground for supposing that they sought the blessing of our Saviour for their children, perceiving him to be an excellent man, under the influence of that feeling so common among the Jews, which led them always to desire a blessing from the hand of the worthy, the esteemed, and the renowned. He has, moreover, evidently mistaken the force of *τοιούτων*, *of such*. Instead of referring its interpretation to qualities existing in the children, he refers it to states of mind in the parents, and acts performed by them. Of such, i. e., according to his interpretation, not, such in reference to themselves, but such in reference to their parents. This seems to us an unwarrantable stretch of exegetical license, to meet a supposed theological necessity. It is certainly going away from the text to find an argument, instead of finding the argument in the text.

The passage, with Mr. S.'s interpretation of *τοιούτων* in the first instance—"these, and such as are like them"—presents, indeed, no real difficulty. It does not commit our Saviour to any inconsistency. It does not pledge him to the salvation of unregenerate persons. His mind in this part of the passage, as we have remarked, substantially rested on qualities more than on individuals,—on affections, more than on those who were the subjects of them. Hence, observing humility, tenderness and trustful affection in the children, an absence

of self-seeking and freedom from actual sin, he said, to all that possess such qualities, belongs the kingdom of heaven. These are the affections, on the ground of which men are saved. And we infer the rectitude of this reference from the fact, that in the parallel places, both in Mark and Luke, the verse in question is followed by another, showing the necessity of the qualities which attracted his attention in the little children,—"Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." These texts determine the meaning of *τοιούτων*, as indicative of resemblance—"ὡς παῖδιον"—as a little child.

But we are not prepared to admit our author's philological reasoning on the force of the word *τοιούτων*—of such. He says:—

"For the use of the word *τοιούτος* in other connections, see Mark 4: 33—'And with many *such* parables spake he the word unto them,' i. e., with these, and many that are like them. John 4: 23,—'The Father seeketh *such* to worship him,' i. e., such as true worshippers, including of course the true worshippers themselves. John 9: 16—'How can a man that is a sinner do *such* miracles?' i. e., these miracles now witnessed, and such as are like them. In several other instances the word is used in the same manner, nor am I apprized of any opposing usage. It seems necessary, therefore, to suppose the Saviour to have recognized these children, thus brought to him, as *themselves members of his kingdom*."

In the first place, we do not think the passages adduced by Mr. S. clear cases of such a use of the Greek word as he maintains. The evangelist, Mark, records a few parables, as a specimen, and then adds, With many parables of this kind he spake the word unto them; meaning, not with these and such as these, but with parables of which these are examples. In like manner, in regard to his second passage, we should say that Christ has described certain traits of a true worshipper, adding, the Father seeketh such as have these traits, to worship him; the interpretation of Mr. S. being a manifest tautology. In respect to the third, either one of the two exegeses which we are about to propose seems to us preferable to that given by Mr. S. The first has reference to the healing of the blind man, as a model-miracle; and the question then would be, How can a man that is a sinner perform a miracle or miracles, of which this is a specimen?—not this miracle and others like it, but miracles resembling this in their convincing character, and in the difficulties standing in the way.



of their accomplishment. The other and kindred interpretation is one in which the force of the question rests upon the contrasted terms, "a man that is a sinner," in one member of the sentence, and "such miracles," in the other. The greatness of the miracle is contrasted with the incompetency of the man, by reason of his being a sinner, for the performance of it.

But, again, even if these were clear cases of such a meaning of the word *τοιούτος*, this is not the universal, nor perhaps even the common usage. So that, instead of serving as a decisive philological argument in his favor, it cannot be regarded as any argument at all. The term *τοιούτος* is used most evidently in two other senses;—one is, these very, or this very one; and the other, those who resemble, necessarily excluding the object of comparison. Of the former sense, we select from many examples which we have marked, the following: Matt. 9: 8. "And they glorified God, who had given *such* power unto men," i. e., the power by which Jesus wrought miracles. Luke 13: 2. "Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered *such* things?" i. e., this very calamity, that Pilate mingled their blood with the sacrifices. Acts 16: 24. "Who having received *such* a charge," i. e., this very charge or command. Acts 22: 22. "Away with *such* a fellow from the earth," i. e., this very fellow. 2 Cor. 12: 3. "I knew *such* a man," i. e., this very man of whom he was speaking. For a similar usage, compare 1 Cor. 5: 5. 7: 15, 28. 2 Cor. 2: 7. 3: 4, 12. 10: 11. 11: 13. 12: 3, 5. Gal. 6: 1. 2 Thes. 3: 12. Tit. 3: 11, etc. As an example of the other sense, resemblance, we give the following: Acts 26: 29. "I would to God that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether *such* as I am, except these bonds." 2 Cor. 10: 11. "Such as we are in word by letters, when we are absent, *such* will we be also in deed, when we are present." Eph. 5: 27. "That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any *such* thing." In each of these cases, any thing more than the idea of resemblance is evidently absurd. In the *Odyssey* of Homer (*A*, 269) we find a similar usage of the word.

ἀλλ' οὐπω τοιούτον ἐγὼν ἶδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν.

I have never seen *such* an one;—where, of course the one



seen cannot be included, for this one he had seen. A like case occurs in the Antigone of Sophocles, γινώσκων ὅτι τοιοῦτος ἐστίν, οἷς περ ἡδεται ξυνών, that he is *such* as those with whom he loves to be. Fritzsche, on the passage we are considering, quotes with approbation the criticism of Theophylact—τῶν τοιούτων—τῶν μιμουμένων τὴν ἀπλότητα τούτων—resembling their simplicity. With this agree Beza and Wetstein. Olshausen, in the same spirit, remarks, “The Redeemer proposed the children to the apostles as symbols of the spiritual birth, and of the childlike and simple feeling which accompanies it.” Rosenmüller espouses the same view, and adds, “It is not said τῶν τούτων, of these infants, viz., the infants that were brought to Christ.”

Mr. S. proceeds to say, “Now from Luke 18: 15, it appears that these children, thus received as members of the kingdom, were some of them at least *infants*. It is evident, also, that these infants were the children of believing parents; for they brought them to Jesus in faith, that he might bless them.” On these sentences we remark, that the views above given on the meaning of τῶν τοιούτων, of such, do not permit us to regard it as certain that the children themselves were received as members of Christ’s kingdom, or church. Nor is it evident that these infants were the children of believing parents, by whom they were brought to Jesus in faith. For, as we have remarked, we have no information in the New Testament that it was the parents who brought them; but only, that they were brought;—possibly by remote relatives, by grandparents, uncles and aunts, elder brothers and sisters, or even by guardians, teachers, or others temporarily interested in them. Still less is any thing said by either of the evangelists of the faith of those who brought them. Mr. S. adds, “Christ then says, ‘Suffer *the* little children’ (for the original, as already observed, employs the article) ‘to come unto me,’ and declares them members of his kingdom.” We have shown, on philological grounds, that it is not clear that Christ declared these infants members of his kingdom. He asserted nothing concerning their church-relationship; he said only that the peculiar rewards of the Christian dispensation, the joys of heaven, were to be given to those who in humility and docility of spirit, and in affectionate confidence, resembled them. Relying on such premises, he states his conclusion as follows: “From this it is

natural to infer, that all such children—in other words, all the little children of believing parents, being consecrated to Christ by faith, and in the way of his appointment, are to be considered members of his kingdom.” But as he has not made good his premises, his conclusion must fall to the ground. If the argument have false principles for its foundation, the result must be false also.

In recurring in his next paragraph to the word *τοιούτος*, Mr. S. commits again the same error as before. He says that the term denotes a class, and adds, “How far this class extends, whether to all children, and even to all adults who in humility of disposition resemble them, it is not necessary for our present purpose to decide. It evidently extends—and this is far enough for the argument—to all children *of the same age and circumstances* as the children in question, i. e., to all the infants and young children of believing parents, who bring their offspring in faith to Christ for his blessing.” He reasons as if the design of our Saviour were to show, in this passage, who should be members of his kingdom. Yet it is most plain that the words are employed simply to set forth the reason why Christ was willing to receive and bless the children that were brought to him.

The following is his summing up of the argument, from the passage in Matt. 19: 14:—

“It appears, therefore, from the foregoing considerations, especially from the usage of *τοιούτων*, *of such*, what is also evident from the nature of the case, that, not only the children noticed in Matt. 19, but all children of similar condition,—in other words, all the little children of believing parents, when consecrated to Christ by faith and in the way of his appointment, are to be considered members of his kingdom. And if members of his kingdom, then certainly no good reason can be given why they should not be members of his church, which is the only visible presentation of his kingdom, which in fact is his kingdom.”

We have stated the philological reasons which compel us to dissent from the conclusions of Mr. S. We have, besides, reasons belonging under a different category. Mr. S. had already stated that there are some who are properly members of Christ's kingdom, and others who are members of it improperly, as there were tares and wheat in the field, good fish and bad in the net, from which the valuable was to be selected and preserved, and the valueless, cast away. The burden of his whole argument is, to show that the infant children of believing parents are properly members of Christ's

kingdom or church. But we know that the children of believing parents are involved in the depravity of the race, as truly as others. They are born, under the same necessity of being regenerated. And the water of baptism does not confer upon them the qualities which are implanted only by the new birth. If they grow up, they will certainly grow up to commit sin and to love it. Now we ask with all seriousness, could Christ mean to say, that his kingdom (church) is properly composed of persons who will infallibly choose sin rather than holiness, and walk with pleasure the downward road, as soon as they are competent to do so? Is this a church after his heart, who gave himself for the church, that he might, in the last day, present it to himself "a glorious church, having neither spot, nor wrinkle, nor any such thing, but holy and without blemish"? Yet if the infant children of believing parents are recognized by our Lord as proper members of his church, such a result will follow—a result from which every person who has a true idea of the nature of a Christian church, it seems to us, must shrink. How soon, on such a ground, the church will become the world, and the world, the church; not by the transfusion of holiness through the world, but by the transfusion of worldliness through the church.

Mr. S. affirms in the paragraph last quoted, that "all the little children of believing parents, when consecrated to Christ by faith, and in the way of his appointment, are to be considered members of his kingdom." In recognizing the membership of these young children in the kingdom of Christ, he avows his opinion that our Saviour designed to recognize their membership in the church. But on this point, considered as a matter of theological faith, some important questions arise. How long do these children continue to be members of the churches into which they are thus inducted? How long does Christ recognize them as good and worthy members? Many of them, it is known to the whole community, grow up to lead profligate and wicked lives. The evidences of their unregeneracy appear on every side. Instead of honoring religion, and proving ornaments to their churches, some of them become decided infidels. They scoff at religion and its professors, and openly deny the Lord Jesus. Persons of whom these things are true, either are, or they are not, still members in good standing in



their respective churches—in the churches into whose fellowship they were baptized, on the faith of their parents. If the hand of church-fellowship has been withdrawn from them, the records of the church will show the time when, and the circumstances under which this church act was passed. If no such record exists, or if the act has never been passed, they are still members, in the same sense, under the same relations, as on the day when they were baptized. Their admission was a formal act, their excision must be a formal act also. But, if the church holds them in its embrace, does Christ, the head of the church, still recognize their membership? Does he acknowledge the validity of their claim to a place among the saints in the household of faith? He has once recognized them as a holy seed, as rightful members of his church and kingdom, when they were brought in faith to the altar, by believing parents. If, in consequence of their unregeneracy and wickedness, he casts them off, as unworthy members, he dishonors his immutability; first doing, and then undoing what he had done; first receiving, and afterwards rejecting those whom he had received; first welcoming them as members of his spiritual household, and afterwards denying that they are his people, or that he will be their God. What becomes of his assurance, “It is not the will of your heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish.” “My sheep shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.” They *were* his sheep; else he could not consistently have welcomed them as proper members of his church and kingdom. If he casts them off, the glory of his veracity is tarnished. The ruin of one of his attributes draws down the ruin of all the rest. And he that was the brightness of the Father’s glory, loses even the glory which belongs to an upright and truthful man. If he does not cast them off, in consequence of their unregeneracy and wickedness, if he does not refuse any longer to hold that particular relation to them, as members of his church, which he entered into when they were baptized on the faith of believing parents, then it follows that all who are thus baptized when they are children, will certainly be saved. It follows, also, that not regeneration, not holiness, not personal faith in the Lord Jesus, but baptism on a parent’s faith is the great turning point of a sinner’s salvation.



We do not charge these results upon Mr. S. as a part of his creed. We believe he would shrink from them with as much horror as we do ourselves. We merely state them, as necessarily involved in the ground-principles which he has laid down. The same may be said of the two following statements. 1. In asserting the right of the infant children of believing parents to the dignity of church-members, and maintaining, as he does afterwards, that they are to be considered "as belonging to Christ's own fold, the Saviour's lambs, . . . by the initiatory rite, solemnly introduced among the number of Christ's disciples, . . . admitted to a standing in the younger classes of the Saviour's school, constituted heirs of the peculiar Christian blessings," he seems either to deny the depravity of such infants altogether, or else to make the administration of baptism, and the fact of having pious parents, cleanse it away, or,—the only possible supposition besides,—to assert with strange inconsistency, that reigning depravity, and acknowledged unregeneracy, may exist in those who are properly members of Christ's own fold, the Saviour's lambs, among the number of Christ's disciples, constituted heirs of the peculiar Christian blessings, etc.

2. Again, by an unguarded form of expression, Mr. S. seems almost to put parental faith, in reference to baptized children, in the place of the atonement itself. He says, "If the privilege actually bestowed in Matt. 19, upon some very small children, was not bestowed on account of their innate goodness, it must have been on account of the faith of those who offered them." The privilege alluded to is Christ's recognition of the church-membership of the little ones brought to him, and of their personal interest in his kingdom. The moral qualifications requisite for admission to the heavenly world, are precisely the same as the moral qualifications for admission to the church on earth. The qualifications for both are exclusively moral qualifications. He who has the necessary moral qualifications, has a right to come to the church on earth, and to expect admission into it; and he who is welcomed to the church on earth, will be welcomed to the church of the first-born in glory. But Mr. S. says, these infants were welcomed "on account of the faith of those who offered them." Is not this equivalent to putting the faith of the believing parent in the place

of the atonement? Is not here a new way of salvation—by the faith of a proxy—proposed?

We have only to remark, further, under this head, that Mr. S. makes what seems to us a most unwarrantable distinction between baptized and unbaptized children, in respect to their final salvation. He says, "The salvation of all children is a matter of inference, more than of promise; that of the children of believers, a matter of explicit promise as well as inference." We fully believe that all who die in infancy will be saved. But we question if Mr. S. can find a single text where the salvation of infants is explicitly promised; or, whether it be promised or inferrible, we question if any distinction can be clearly made out either in promises or premises, giving the children of believers any advantage, as to the fact, or the ground of salvation, over the children of unbelievers.

The closing paragraphs of this section deserve a moment's notice, because they contain our author's recognition of a difficulty which some minds would be likely to feel, and also his summing up, in a few words, of the argument of the section.

"We confess that Christ did not *baptize* these children, for he never baptized any one. Nor did he admit them to the church; for under the old dispensation, being Jews, they were already members, and the church under the new dispensation, was not yet organized. But he declared them members of his kingdom, and that too, probably, on account of the faith of the parents; and, if members of his kingdom, then fit subjects of church-membership, whenever the church should become, under its new organization, the visible presentation of his kingdom.

"In short, we understand Christ to say, that children offered to him in faith, by believing parents, are to be recognized as *his*. They belong to his kingdom, and when that kingdom comes to have a church organization, they will rightfully belong to his church; for what is the church, but the members of Christ's kingdom organized according to his appointment? And if this be so, then the children of believers were intended by Christ to be members of his church."

The sum of this argument seems to us to be, that although Christ had already, by his example, if not by precept, instituted baptism as the introductive rite of the Christian church, the primary ordinance of the Christian dispensation, yet he neither baptized these children, whom he recognized as his disciples, nor directed them to be baptized. Further, the spiritual church organization of the New Testament did not yet exist; but only the national Jewish sodality, composed

alike of saints and sinners, the wicked and the holy, the regenerate and the unregenerate; whose bond of union was nationality, and their common institute and introductive ordinance, circumcision. Because the infants were members of this unspiritual organization, Mr. S. infers that Christ recognized them as fit subjects of membership in the spiritual and distinctive church of the new dispensation; although the terms of membership in the latter, are evidently so different from the terms of membership in the former; the requisites, in the one case, being, Jewish birth and circumcision; in the other, moral qualifications. Because they are members of a society of one sort, they will therefore be members of another society of a different sort, when it comes to exist. And because these Jewish children were recognized by our Lord as members of the national compact of the Jews, and entitled to its privileges, and also, as members, of whatever of church-character belonged to that compact, therefore the children of all believing parents are members of the Christian church.

We pass over what we have before intimated, that there was no proper, visible church under the ancient dispensation; the Jewish community might have symbolized the church; but it had no claim to be considered the church, under a less spiritual organization;—that Christ uttered no recognition of the membership of the infants brought to him in any church or in his kingdom; but merely designed to say that those who resembled them in simplicity and guilelessness, were rightful members of his kingdom;—and that the probability that the children were recognized as members of his kingdom on account of the faith of their parents, is, to say the least, very small; partly because we have no certain information whether they had parents, or whether, if they had, those parents were pious or ungodly; and partly because, being born Jews, and circumcised according to the law of Moses, they were entitled to whatever belonged to the privileges of Judaism, whether they had believing parents or not; and that the statement that the children were declared members of Christ's kingdom, "probably on account of the faith of their parents," is, so far as appears from the Scriptures, a gratuitous assumption.



§2. *Argument from the apostolic commission.*

In the third section of Chap. I, Mr. S. endeavors to sustain the doctrine of infant church-membership from the apostolic commission. He takes the form of it contained in Matt. 28: 18—20, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." In arguing from this passage, he attempts to show, first, that the commission includes a command to baptize infants; and, secondly, that baptism constitutes those who regularly receive it, members of the Christian church. Under the first, he remarks that the passage "goes to confirm the doctrine of infant church-membership, not because children are expressly named as the proper subjects of baptism, but because they *are not expressly excluded*." This conclusion he sustains by three considerations,—1. the nature of the term used by our Lord, μαθητεύσατε, *teach*; 2. the fact that the apostles to whom the commission was given were Jews, who would interpret our Lord's words in the light of the old dispensation, and under its influences; and, 3. that in the admission of proselytes to the rites of Judaism, the children of the proselyte are said to have been circumcised and baptized, as well as the proselyte himself. We think that it can be shown, on the contrary, that the children are expressly excluded. We will attempt briefly to prove that the term μαθητεύσατε does not necessarily, or even probably, include the children of those who should become proselytes to Christianity, in any such way as to require their baptism without the qualification of personal faith; that the apostles, though they were Jews, would not, doubtless, interpret the commission of the new dispensation by the light of principles which belonged to the old; and that the case of the children of proselytes, who were engrafted into the Jewish national organization, is not in point, and therefore proves nothing concerning the baptism or church-membership of the infant children of believers in the spiritual organization of Christianity.

We said, it can be shown that in the formula of the apostolic commission, infants are expressly excluded from being baptized on account of their parents' faith. As this

commission pertained to a new dispensation, the apostles would naturally explain it on the principles of the new dispensation, and not on the principles of the old. They knew nothing in respect to the institutes of the new dispensation, either the modes or the subjects of them, any further than they were instructed by their Master. They would not have presumed to exceed his instructions, on the ground of any apology drawn from the dispensation that was now abolished. And as the Christian dispensation was new, its ordinances new, and the subjects of them new (the female sex being admitted, which was formerly excluded), it follows that Christ would doubtless not leave his apostles to interpret the extent of any part of his instructions by inferences drawn from the Jewish economy. Hence, those who are not expressly included in the commission, as proper subjects of the ordinance of baptism, are, in fact, expressly excluded. But of this more hereafter.

We promised to show that the term *μαθητεύσατε*, *teach, make disciples of*, does not necessarily, or even probably, include the children of those who should become proselytes to Christianity, in any such way as to require their baptism without the qualification of personal faith. Knapp remarks (*Theology*, vol. II, p. 534), "From the passage, Matt. 28: 29, it does not necessarily follow that Christ commanded infant baptism; the *μαθητεύειν* is neither for nor against." As this is a philological question, however, we must inquire into the use of the Greek verb *μαθητεύω*, and of the kindred substantive, *μαθητής*. For what Wetstein remarks, that "a *mild and liberal* exposition of *μαθητεύω* is to be preferred to a rigid interpretation," we cannot admit. The rules of hermeneutics make no such demand. Where the *usus loquendi* teaches us distinctly the force of any word, and the context, in any given case, does not oppose it, we are obliged to regard that as its meaning. We are not at liberty to shun the rigid interpretation, for the sake of avoiding a doctrine or a rite which our creed does not happen to recognize. The verb occurs but four times in the New Testament. Once it appears with an intransitive signification, and is equivalent to *μαθητής. ἔμι*, *to be a disciple*, Matt. 27: 57—"a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who himself also was Jesus' disciple." Comp. John 19: 38, where *ὢν μαθητής* is used. Once it has the passive form, Matt. 13: 52—"Every scribe which is instructed unto the kingdom of God, is like unto a man that is

an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." Once it implies to instruct or train as disciples, Acts 14: 21—"And when they had preached the gospel in that city, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, etc." The remaining instance is in the text under consideration. In the first two, the word is used of persons of an age competent to be instructed and convinced. The third and fourth belong to one class, and must be interpreted by a comparison of the other two, and by reference to the kindred substantive, *μαθητής*, *disciple*. This latter word occurs in the New Testament nearly three hundred times. It is applied to the followers of John the Baptist, and of the Pharisees, to the converts to Christianity generally, and especially to the twelve apostles. It is also used in a generic manner. We have its definition, moreover, from the pen of inspiration, and from the lips of our Lord himself. Light is cast upon the meaning of the word by the known character of the persons to whom it is applied. When it is applied to the followers of John the Baptist, or of the Pharisees, it signifies those who espoused their cause, listened with approval to their instructions, adopted their principles, and trod in their steps. Its meaning is the same, when it is applied to the followers of our Lord. We know certainly what the apostles were; not the mere partizans of a new sect; not formal attendants upon Christ's ministry, as a system of whose truthfulness and authority they were intellectually convinced; but holy men, who loved the truth and obeyed it, and who were ready to suffer every self-denial, and death itself, for the sake of their Master. They were men of humble pretensions, but of a blameless life. They were, to use a New Testament term in its full sense, saints.\* Now if this be the true meaning of the term, as applied to all who are made disciples of Christ, we understand what he meant when he said, "Go ye, therefore, and *teach*, *μαθητεύσατε*, all nations, baptizing them, etc." But we can obtain confirmation of this meaning. Christ said, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed," i. e., a disciple indeed, or a genuine disciple, *μαθητής*, is one who continues in Christ's word, that is, obedient to his commands, John

\*The fact that Judas was numbered with the twelve, does not detract from the truth of this general statement. For it is usual for the Scriptures to speak of men as being such as they profess themselves to be, or such as they are generally taken to be, without committing the Spirit of inspiration to an expression of opinion, whether they are truly such or not. Comp. Acts 8: 13, with 8: 21, 23.



8: 31. Again, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another," John 13: 35; i. e., Christ's disciples are persons of a religious spirit and profession, who are ruled by the dictates of love. And again, "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples," John 15: 8; i. e., disciples of Christ are those who bring forth much spiritual fruit. In Acts 6: 1, 2, 3, the twelve address the multitude of the disciples under the title of brethren; whence disciples are those whom the apostles termed "brethren." In Acts 9: 1, it is said of Saul, that he yet breathed out "threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord." In v. 13, Ananias says, "Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem." Whence, by comparing these two texts, we perceive that disciples are those who are properly called also saints, i. e., holy persons. In the same chapter, Ananias, who was sent of God to Saul, at the time when the latter lay sightless and fasting, at Damascus, is denominated a "disciple." In Acts 13: 52, it is said, "the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost;" hence, disciples are those who are competent to these emotions and characteristics. In Acts 14: 22, we are told that Paul and Barnabas went from city to city, "confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith." Disciples, therefore, are persons who may continue and be confirmed in the faith. In Acts 16: 1, Timothy, whose character and spirit are so well known, is termed a disciple. In Acts 18: 23, we are told that Paul "went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia, in order, strengthening all the disciples." A disciple, then, is one who may be strengthened by apostolic ministrations. And finally, the disciples are those who were called Christians, first, in Antioch, Acts 11: 26. Such Christians as composed the church in Antioch were disciples. Now, Mr. S. remarks, and we freely concede, that μαθητεύσατε, in the first part of the apostolic commission, signifies properly, *make disciples*. But if the New Testament sense of the word *disciples* be such as has now been shown, and we certainly find no other, if this is the kind of disciples whom Christ commissioned his apostles, under the influence of his divine energy and co-operation, to make, and then to baptize them, we ask if infant children are not "*expressly excluded*"

by the terms of the commission? Could infants be made disciples, in such a sense? And if they could not, where is the authority, in this formula, for baptizing them?

We proposed to show, in the second place, that the apostles, though they were Jews, would not doubtless interpret the commission of the new dispensation by the light of principles which belonged to the old. Mr. S. thus states this part of the argument:

“It is to be remembered that these original teachers were *all Jews*. They had been accustomed to infant church-membership, by the invariable usage of their church. The initiatory ordinance was uniformly administered to the children, not on account of personal faith, but of parental connection. Nor was it unusual for them to witness the introduction of Gentile proselytes into the Jewish church; in which case, the infants and children of the family were received by the same introductory rite. Suppose that the apostles had been sent forth into the Gentile world to make proselytes to the Jewish religion, and the Saviour had said, ‘Go, disciple all nations, circumcising, and instructing them in all the ordinances and commandments of Jehovah,’ could there have been a question, whether children were to be received with their parents? Certainly not. On the same principle, we must believe that baptism was administered, as a matter of course, to the offspring of believers in connection with themselves.”

It is granted that the original teachers were all Jews; but they were not, therefore, void of discrimination. The Holy Spirit, who aided them in every emergency, doubtless, would not fail to give clearness to their perceptions in respect to every precept or precedent by which the church would be likely to be moulded in all coming time. Now, as we have already said, the dispensation was a new dispensation; the church under the Lord Jesus was a new and spiritual organization; the qualifications requisite for admission to its privileges were new qualifications. Not national descent, not parental faith, but personal discipleship was the new principle of church union, and the condition of church privileges. The question under this new system was not with respect to pedigree or sex, but discipleship. And thus it was that without a distinct specification, pointing out believing females as proper subjects of baptism and of admission to the church, the apostles, acting under the broad and intelligible authority of the commission, went from city to city, teaching and baptizing “both men and women.” The inquiry arising in their minds, in fulfilling the behest entrusted to them, was not, “how will this usage comport with the customs of

Judaism?" but, "is it a fulfilment of the commission of the new dispensation?" Hence it was that they so naturally fell into the practice of baptizing females, that we hear not a word of their specific authority for so doing, till we find that they have actually done it. And then, on turning back to the commission, we recognize, at once, their authority for doing it, in the form of their instructions. We repeat it, the apostles were men of discrimination; and under a new dispensation, whose institutes were new, whose privileges were new, whose subjects were new, whose demands were new, they would not have thought of going back to the old dispensation to find the rules of the new. If they had interpreted the commission by the light of Judaism, as Pædobaptist writers generally affirm, children would have been admitted; but, on the same ground, all females would have been excluded. The interpretation which embraces the one, by the same authority rejects the other. But we know that this was not the interpretation they adopted. They baptized "both men and women." They were, therefore, evidently not guided by the rules of the Mosaic economy, but by the more spiritual rules laid down by the Lord Jesus. They could expound Christ's commission so as to admit to baptism and the Lord's supper one class of persons (females), not admissible to their national rights under Judaism, although they might have been disciples (*μαθητευόμενοι*). With the same discernment they could exclude another class (infants), admissible under Judaism, because they were not disciples (*μαθητευόμενοι*). This is precisely what they did. We are not, therefore, to think of them as reading their commission through Jewish eyes, or hearing it with Jewish ears; but as Christian men, taught under a new economy in the school of Christ, drawing their principles from the new and living fountain. We are to conceive of them as of any Gentile believer, going forth at the present day to the heathen under the same commission, making disciples, and baptizing those who, by his instrumentality, are thus made, and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded.

The supposition introduced by Mr. S. in this paragraph, though it may have the air of great clearness and force, as if it would settle the matter by appealing to a parallel case, is peculiarly unhappy. Its misfortune is that it is wholly Jewish. If the Saviour had sent forth the apostles into the



Gentile world to make proselytes to the Jewish religion, commanding them to "disciple all nations, to circumcise, and instruct them in all the commandments and ordinances of Jehovah," this would have been a command to perpetuate the principles and the rites of the Jewish economy. One of those principles was the command to circumcise every male-child. Hence, in obeying such a commission, there could have been no "question whether the children were to be received with their parents." But when he adds, "on the same principle, we must believe that baptism was administered, as a matter of course, to the offspring of believers in connection with themselves," we must respond, the conclusion by no means follows from the premise. It cannot follow, unless Christianity be Judaism, the principles of the one the same with the principles of the other, the structure of the one like the structure of the other, the terms of admission to the Christian rites the same with the terms of admission to the Jewish rites, and the same subjects and only the same being admissible to each. The inference of Mr. S. is removed *toto cælo* from the premise introduced in his hypothetic proposition.

The case of the children of proselytes who were engrafted into the Jewish national organization furnishes no confirmation of his theory. Granting that the Jew saw the children of Gentile proselytes circumcised and baptized, and admitted with their parents among the chosen people of God; still it was under the principles of an abolished dispensation, in many respects differing from the new one; and the Christian Jew would be sensible of the difference, and interpret the apostolic commission as he had been taught in the school of Christ.

Mr. S. here remarks, "Now, under these circumstances, it is morally impossible that any Jew, having the Saviour's commission, could have hesitated a moment as to the propriety of administering baptism to the little children." It is a sufficient reply to such a decision to present its absurdity by an equivalent assertion in respect to the baptism of females, thus:—Now, under these circumstances, it is morally impossible that any Jew, having the Saviour's commission, could have hesitated a moment as to the impropriety of administering baptism to females.

We have only to say further, in respect to the apostolic commission, that if there be any difficulty in respect to its

interpretation on account of the meaning of terms, light should be sought in the actual proceedings of the apostles, and especially in the parallel passage in the gospel of Mark (16: 15, 16). "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

The second part of this section shows that baptism constitutes those who regularly receive it, members of the Christian church. To this doctrine we have no objection. We do most fully believe it. We assent also to that part of his first limitation, which affirms that while an excommunicated person, though baptized, is not a church-member, yet this fact does not invalidate the general truth; because "the validity of a general rule is not impaired, but rather confirmed, by a few extreme cases which may be adduced as exceptions to it." But when he remarks, in his second limitation, that, in affirming this doctrine, "it is not intended to deny that the children of believers, according to the doctrine of the New England fathers, are in some sense *born church-members*," here we must again dissent from him. It may have been in the creed of the New England fathers, that the children of pious parents are "*born church-members*;" but we think it could not be shown in the creed of the New Testament. We read, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" that the saints "were by nature children of wrath, even as others;" that "the wicked go astray, from the womb, as soon as they are born;" but we find no text which informs us that children who are by nature depraved and confessedly unregenerate, are born, in any sense, church-members. The following sentences under this head seem to us objectionable throughout.

"They are born in the covenant, but are not entitled to the blessings of the covenant, except prospectively, until they receive the sign and seal of the covenant. The engagement has been made, the writings drawn; but the instrument would not be valid, if the persons authorized to act in the case should refuse to sign and seal it. The circumstance of Christian birth may give them a right to admission, and the intention to do for the children after the custom of the law, may secure them the privileges of their birthright, till opportunity for visible initiation is afforded; but if all suitable opportunities for this purpose should be voluntarily neglected, the subjects of such negligence must lose their claim for covenant favors."

From the views contained in this paragraph we must demur in, at least, four particulars. 1. It seems to us that

they destroy the validity of baptism as the initiatory ordinance,—the very thing which our author, under this general head, undertakes to prove. He says, the children of pious parents are born church-members. Of what value, then, is the ordinance of baptism as an initiating ceremony? Does it initiate them into a society into which they are already initiated? Does it introduce them to that to which they are already introduced by the fact of their being born of believing parents? He says, baptism is an act visibly uniting its recipients to the church. But if they are born church-members, they are already members of the visible church; visibly united to the church; and of course baptism is not required to unite them to it visibly. He first adopts the error of the synod, held in Boston in 1662, “by appointment of the general court, to discuss the extent of baptism, and of communion between particular churches,”—“They that, according to Scripture, are members of the visible church, are the subjects of baptism,”—and then makes baptism “the introductive ordinance,” by whose efficacy they become members. To us, this exhibits baptism as little better than a mere nullity. The qualifying clause, “in some sense, born church-members,” does not obviate the difficulty. In this matter, we see no half-way position. Either the children are church-members, or they are not. The Scriptures describe no indefinite limbo, in which persons, of any age, hang suspended in equilibrio, neither in the church, nor out of it; partly in it, and partly not in it; members, and yet not members, at one and the same time. We find it neither in the gospels, nor the epistles; neither during our Saviour’s incarnation, nor after his ascension. Nor does reason acknowledge such a relation, any more than the Scriptures. If the children are not in the church, and this view be agreed upon, then baptism can be described as the initiating rite. If they are born church-members, then baptism is, in this respect, an unmeaning ceremony.

2. We are impressed, on the other hand, with the belief that the views expressed by our author in this quotation, lay too much stress upon baptism. They well-nigh make it the door to eternal life. He says that the children of believers, “though born in the covenant, are not entitled to the blessings of the covenant, except prospectively, until they receive the sign and seal of the covenant,”—which is baptism. By



the supposition, God has entered into covenant with the child through his believing parent, and yet the child will reap no benefit from that covenant, until he is baptized. God has made an engagement to the parent, "I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed," and yet the instrument will not be valid, nor the divine engagement fulfilled, until the parent has had his child bedewed with hallowed water at the baptismal font. If the parents repeatedly neglect suitable opportunities of bringing their children to this ordinance, "the subjects of such negligence must lose their claim for covenant favors." That we have not misinterpreted our author is abundantly evident, because his next sentence is, "Wherefore it is said in Gen. 17, that the child who is not circumcised at the appointed time, though born in the covenant, shall be cut off from the privileges of his birthright;" or, as the Scripture stands, "that soul shall be cut off from his people."

3. We object to these views, because they seem to give the parent undue power over the present and eternal condition of his child, a power which we believe God has not entrusted to any human hands. The covenant into which God enters with his people under the present dispensation, has reference to moral purification and other spiritual blessings in this world and eternal life in the world to come, Heb. 8: 8-12. If God has entered into any covenant with believing parents in respect to their seed, the covenant is of this nature. But the sentences just now cited, prove that, if the views here expressed be correct, the child may be cut off by the parent's neglect, from all these blessings, both present and eternal.

4. Our last objection to these views is, that after exhibiting the children of believing parents, as "born church-members," "born in the covenant," "the engagement made," "entitled, prospectively, for a season, to covenant blessings," they represent them as yet liable to be cut off from the whole. God has entered into covenant, it is said, with the believing parent, in reference first to himself, and then to his child; and that, not because the child is baptized, but because he is the child of a believing parent. But at length, in some cases, the child, once on such high ground of religious privilege, falls. God recedes from the covenant into which he had entered. His engagement is broken; and the child, born in the covenant, born a church-member, is cast

away ; not on account of his own sin, but because his parents have failed "to do for him after the custom of the law." The child is first received, and then rejected. He is first chosen, and then cast off. He is first declared to be one of God's peculiar people, by virtue of the relation which he sustains, and afterwards, he is repulsed from that condition, and becomes a child of the wicked one. Nor can it be said that this is a parallel case with that of the Jews, once God's chosen nation, but long since removed from his peculiar regards. His covenant with the Jews was a national covenant ; their sin, a national sin ; their rejection, a national punishment. And even in their rejection, a provision is made for their restoration to the divine favor. But the case here exhibited is that of an individual ; the covenant was an absolute covenant, or a covenant conditioned only on the fact of the parents' faith ; the sin, leading to the child's rejection, is not his own, but his parents' ; and no provision is made for his recovery. Thus, too, the divine immutability, as we have before remarked, seems to us to be sacrificed. Can these views be correct ?

Having stated his two limitations of the doctrine, our author proceeds to the point proposed, viz., to show that baptism constitutes those who regularly receive it, church-members. This he sustains by three considerations. 1. That baptism in the new dispensation has taken the place of circumcision in the old. 2. Admission by baptism appears to have been the invariable apostolic custom. 3. The formula of baptism implies that baptism is the initiatory ordinance. We are to baptize *into* (*εἰς*) the name of the Father, etc. On the two latter points, he speaks clearly and well, because scripturally. We fully accord with his remark under the second—"Nor is there the slightest intimation of any other mode of admission to the Christian church."

Of the first of his three considerations, we must speak less favorably. He states the argument as follows :

"It has been already proved that circumcision was the introductory ordinance of the Jewish church, and that baptism under the new dispensation has taken the place of circumcision under the old ; from which it follows that baptism is the introductory ordinance to the Christian church."

§3. *Is baptism a substitute for circumcision?*

On the general topic of the substitution of baptism for circumcision, we have already spoken to some extent (p. 462), and to that place we refer our readers. Before we finally dismiss this part of the subject, however, we shall take leave to propose a few additional considerations, which seem to us to militate against such a theory. 1. If baptism has taken the place of circumcision, it ought rightfully to be administered to the same subjects; to the believer himself, and to every male connected with him, born in his house, or bought with his money—both infants and adults; as Abraham administered the rite to Ishmael when the latter was thirteen years old, and at the same time, to “every male among the men of his house.” But for such an extent of the administration of baptism, we believe no one pleads. Yet, if it be, by divine appointment, a substitute for circumcision, we see not why its application should be confined within narrower limits. Again, under the same view, we see not why the apostles should feel themselves authorized to baptize both men and women. Where, in the patent of circumcision, is any authority given for it? If it be said, as it usually is, that the authority is derived from the enlarged spirit of the Christian dispensation, we have two answers. 1. In positive institutes, God gives not even to apostles the right to interpret his will as to the extent to which an ordinance is to be administered, by an inference drawn from the wider or narrower spirit of a later or an earlier economy. In establishing a positive institute, he defines the institute itself, its limitations, and the subjects of it. 2. We have seen that while modern Pædobaptists admit their infant seed, both male and female, to the ordinance of baptism, contrary to the express limitations of the covenant of circumcision, they exclude their servants, male and female, though bought with their money, and committed to their trust, and even their adult children of both sexes, also contrary to the express extension of the same covenant. If the first case is owing to the enlarged spirit of Christianity, must we say the second is to be ascribed to its exclusiveness? How shall the abettors of infant baptism meet these opposite difficulties, still affirming that baptism has, by divine appointment, taken the



place of circumcision? In avoiding Scylla, they are plunged into Charybdis.

2. If baptism is substituted for circumcision, its meaning and efficacy ought to be the same. It ought to be a divinely acknowledged token of the same fact. Circumcision was a token of nationality. It asserted the right of its subjects to all the privileges of God's chosen people. As soon as the children who had been circumcised were physically capable of those privileges, they were every way competent to enjoy them; and, religious or irreligious, regenerate or unregenerate, they had a right to participate in them, through life. They had also the right and were under obligation to circumcise their children, and bring them likewise to the solemn feasts of the nation, and to all its privileges. But the baptism of infants is not the divinely acknowledged token of the union of the children with any such economy as that of Judaism. There is no such modern economy. The spiritual organization of the Christian church is far different. Besides, if it be said that baptism is the divinely acknowledged token of their discipleship, this we deny; for some of them are not, and never become disciples, in the New Testament sense, but live and die in their sins. And God does not acknowledge the existence of that which neither does exist, nor ever will. If baptism and circumcision, in the language of Dr. Mason, "both signify and seal that wondrous change in the state of a sinner, whereby, being justified by faith, he passes from condemnation into acceptance with God," if they "represent, and are the means of obtaining that real purity which is effected by the Spirit of Christ," and which "is the characteristic of all those members of his church who are justified by faith in his blood,"—it would seem that all, or certainly most persons, who are baptized, with only here and there an exception, ought, as if sanctified from the womb, to grow up Christians. But experience demonstrates that baptism is not the seal of piety in this manner. If baptism be in the place of circumcision, all who have been baptized should be deemed admissible to all the privileges of the Christian church, without the subsequent requirement of confirmation or profession. But would this be permitted as the rule of Pædobaptist churches? They should, also, have a right, whatever be

their moral character, to bring their children to the altar. But this right, from the beginning, has been denied.

3. If baptism has taken the place of circumcision, it seems needless that both should have been applied to the same subject. If, as the writers on pædobaptism assert, both are signs of the same fact, both signify the same thing, both are tokens of the same covenant, both are marks of the same dedication, both are appointed pre-requisites of admission to the church, and both are of the same use, it seems to us that a man, who, like Paul, had been circumcised, would have no cause to be baptized also. The same may be said of the "many thousand Jews" who believed, but who, in the language of the elders at Jerusalem, were "all zealous of the law." According to the theory, circumcision had already done for them all that baptism could do. And, if the church is the same under both dispensations, as they assume, to baptize those who had been already circumcised, seems to us little better than an *opus operatum*.

Again, circumcision continued to be practised in the apostolic age by Jewish converts, who were members of the Christian church. Paul foresaw that Timothy would have no influence among them as a minister of Christ, if he were not circumcised; and, therefore, yielding to this demand, "he took and circumcised him." This inflexible requirement of circumcision would not have existed, had the Jewish Christians understood baptism to be a substitute for circumcision. Indeed, so far from discontinuing the rite of circumcision in favor of its alleged substitute, they wished the Gentiles to practise it. The Acts of the Apostles is a book full of instruction on this point. We are told in Acts 15, that while Paul and Barnabas were at Antioch, certain persons came thither from Judea, who, supposing that the Christian religion was intended to perfect the Mosaic, rather than to supersede it, taught the Gentile brethren that they must be circumcised and keep the laws of Moses, or they could not be saved (Acts 15: 1). These persons are described by the council as having "gone out from us" (Acts 15: 24); and by Paul, as having "come from James" (Gal. 2: 12). Whoever they were, they were evidently persons who had some near connection with the church at Jerusalem. The requisition that the Gentile converts, though they had been baptized, should be also circumcised, created "no small dissension and

disputation,"—a clear proof that the fact of the substitution of baptism for circumcision was not a point definitely settled. If it were, there would have been no room for disputation. If it were so understood, why did they send to Jerusalem to inquire of the apostles? Why did they not decide the question themselves? Why did they not obtain and assent to the judgment of Barnabas and Paul, the latter being himself clothed with apostolic authority? Unable, however, to agree, the brethren at Antioch resolved to send Paul and Barnabas to the apostles, elders and members at Jerusalem, "about this question." "When they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done by them." But as soon as the case was stated to these Jewish converts, as soon as they were informed that many Gentiles at Antioch had received the gospel, several of the Jews in the church immediately decided, that it was necessary to circumcise them. "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses." But, had baptism taken the place of circumcision, how could they have decided so directly, that it was necessary that these baptized Gentile converts should be also circumcised? "The apostles and elders came together to consider the matter." After much discussion, James proposed a decision which united the suffrages of all the brethren. The decision was communicated to the church at Antioch, in a letter sent by Paul and Barnabas, and accompanied by Judas and Silas, "chief men among the brethren." This letter, as it seems to us, would have been the place to announce that circumcision was abolished that baptism might take its place; and therefore, the Gentile converts having been baptized, there could be no necessity requiring them to be also circumcised. But nothing like this is intimated. Nothing is said of circumcision in any way. Three or four "necessary things" are enjoined, and the rest is left optional with the brethren. This letter was addressed to the converted Gentiles, stating what things were necessary to be observed by them in relation to the ritual requirements. As to the converted Jews, Moses was read to them in the city, every Sabbath day; and the laws of the Old Testament being



thus familiar to them, it was unnecessary, in this epistle, to give them any particular instruction.

If any one should imagine that because the council said nothing of the importance of circumcision, they were to be understood as granting that it had been superseded by baptism, it ought to be considered that the question which called the brethren together was, whether it was necessary for the believing Gentiles to be circumcised;—not, whether baptism had taken the place of circumcision, so that the validity of the former had abolished the necessity of the latter. The relation of the two rites to one another seems not to have awakened any question, either in the church, or in the council of apostles. Their answer, instead of being confined to the mere rite of circumcision, wisely takes a broader ground in reference to the whole ritual law. If any believing Gentile wishes to be circumcised, let him be circumcised; but if he does not, let not the Jewish convert force him to it. The obligation of believers to be baptized is a matter already settled by the apostolic commission, and has no relation to the present controversy. The matter in debate had reference to the necessity of circumcision as circumcision; not to the relation of that rite to baptism.

Instead of viewing baptism as standing in the place of circumcision, Paul himself, at least in the earlier part of his ministry, appears not to have discouraged the continued practice of the Jewish rite; although he sternly set his face against the spirit which ascribed to it a value equivalent to the inward qualifications of the new birth and faith in Christ. On one of his visits to Jerusalem, subsequent to the one we have just spoken of, James assured him that many thousand Jews who believed, and were all zealous of the law, had been informed that he taught “the Jews among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children.” James seems to have regarded this report as a slander, and he suggests an expedient “by which all may know that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee are nothing, but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.” Paul saw fit to adopt this course, for this end; and from this passage, and others, we learn, that while he acknowledged the baptism of the Christian dispensation, he did not interfere with the continued practice of the rite of circumcision; much less did he teach that baptism

had come into its place. "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law." With the Jews he submitted to the rite, as not interfering with the rite of the Christian economy. He even circumcised the disciple Timothy, his companion, to gratify the Jews. Upon the Gentiles, he forbore to lay the yoke of this bloody ceremony, leaving every one to his own choice, and maintaining that "in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love."

In reasoning on this subject, Mr. S. quotes Col. 2: 11, 12, in such a connection as to lead his readers to suppose that the apostle designs in that passage to recognize baptism as taking the place of circumcision. The words of Paul are, "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," etc. But, as Venema observes, "The apostle simply asserts in these words, that baptism answers to *spiritual* circumcision,"—a fact which Dr. Mason has overlooked. The same author has the remark, "The Scriptures no where assert that baptism holds the place of circumcision."

#### §4. *The argument from 1 Cor. 7: 14.*

The fourth section of this chapter labors to prove that the doctrine of infant church-membership is contained in 1 Cor. 7: 14. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." On this text Mr. S. reasons thus:—

"It appears from these words that the holiness of children thus conditioned was an acknowledged fact in the Corinthian church. This acknowledged holiness of the children is adduced as proof that a certain degree of sanctity or sacredness was thrown around the unbelieving parent, in consequence of his or her connection with a believer. And this latter fact, viz., that an idea of sacredness was associated with the unbeliever when thus conditioned, is a reason why persons thus united in marriage should not separate, on the ground that one has become a Christian, and the other, not. But all the reasoning is based on the acknowledged fact that the children of the parents in question are holy."

On this topic, several considerations are of importance. It should be remembered, in the first place, that the law of God prohibited the intermarriage of Jews with the surrounding heathen (Ex. 34: 12—16. Ez. 9: 10—12. 10: 10). When such marriages, therefore, were contracted, they were, in the sight of God, unlawful; and the fruit of them was unlawful also. Hence, after the captivity, the Jews who had formed connections with foreign women, were required to dismiss their wives and children (Ez. 9: 2. 10: 11, 12—44). In the church at Corinth, there were individuals living in the marriage-state, whose partner, either the husband or the wife, was still a heathen. The question was a very natural one, whether, in such a case, this law of marriage was to be regarded as extending its claims over the spiritual Israel; whether the Christian, in obeying the injunction, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate," must forsake his or her heathen companion, as an unlawful partner. The apostle says, no; and he here gives his reason. The main point in question was not the moral condition of the children of such marriages, or of any children; but whether such marriages should be dissolved. And it was in speaking to this point, that the case of the children was incidentally introduced. We are to examine whether any thing said on this decision is to be regarded as a conclusive argument for the church-membership of the children of believers generally.

We may inquire into the meaning of the whole verse, logically considered; or into the interpretation of the words which are prominent in it. The meaning of the prominent words on which the exegesis of the passage depends, may be ascertained by the *usus loquendi*, the antithesis or opposition in which the principal words are set, one to another, and by the analogy of faith.

Let us, first, observe that the words *ἡγιασται* and *ἁγία*, terms having the nearest possible etymological connection, are both used in the text; "the unbelieving husband *is sanctified* to the wife, and the unbelieving wife *is sanctified* to the husband;" and, the "children are *holy*." The meaning of the verb, if it can be ascertained, may be used to illustrate the meaning of the adjective. If the verb is to be understood in a qualified sense, the adjective is to be understood in a qualified sense also. If it be clear that either one does not imply moral qualities in the highest sense, both being similarly



conditioned, the same may be inferred of the other also. But by the apostle's own supposition, the husband or wife who is sanctified, ἡγιασται, remains unbelieving, ἄπιστος; Hence, the verb translated "to sanctify" must be understood in a qualified sense. And if the verb is interpreted in a manner consistently with the continued unbelief of the person sanctified, so must the adjective be, which asserts the holiness of the children.

Again, if the holiness of the children, in this case, is such as to entitle them to baptism and church-membership, on the faith of the believing parent, for the same reason the sanctification of the unbelieving partner (the terms used being the same) is such as to entitle him or her, in like manner, to baptism and church-membership. If the sanctification or holiness here ascribed both to the unbelieving partner and to the children of a mixed marriage is a moral quality, we ask, what is it but that moral quality which is demanded by the principles we have laid down, to ensure the welcome of any one, child or adult, to baptism and all the privileges of the household of faith? But what is the nature of that sanctification or holiness, which may exist in an unbeliever? Is it a moral quality, or a ceremonial state?

We affirm that it is a ceremonial state. The term ἁγία, *holy*, is used in the text in antithesis with ἀκάθαρτά, *unclean*; and if the latter have reference to a ceremonial condition, so must the former. For such a usage of the term, we refer to the numerous instances in which the chosen nation were called "a holy people," though many of them led wicked and unholy lives; also, to its application to many things among the Jews, which were ceremonially clean, but, in the nature of the case, destitute of moral qualities. In Ezek. 22: 27, the LXX use καθαρός, *clean*, as epexegetical of ἅγιος, *holy*—"Her priests have violated my law, and profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean,"—ἀναμέζον ἁγίου καὶ βεβήλου οὐ διεστέλλον, καὶ ἀναμέζον ἀκαθάρτου καὶ τοῦ καθάρου οὐ διεστέλλον. A like case occurs Ezek. 44: 53. Instances in which ἅγιος, *holy*, is used of ceremonial purity, and not of moral excellence, might be multiplied almost indefinitely.

We do not, however, contend for a ceremonial sense of ἅγιος, *holy*, in the strictly Jewish aspect; but only in a

sense of which the Jewish usage is symbolical and illustrative. Paul, himself a Jew, might not improperly use the term in such a signification, in addressing the Corinthian brethren, who, as they were familiar with the Jewish law of marriage, were doubtless, also familiar with the Jewish usage of the terms holy and unholy, clean and unclean. It strikes us, however, as most illogical, to maintain, that because a child is pronounced holy in a ceremonial or a *quasi* ceremonial sense, he is, therefore, entitled to admission into the church of Christ, notwithstanding the Scriptures set forth moral qualifications as the indispensable condition of that privilege.

Dr. Mason, on this passage, commits the error of interpreting the term "holy," as necessarily implying church-membership. He says it is the opposite of common, or unappropriated to God; and that it means that the children "are born under peculiar relations to God; they are appropriated to him; they are members of his church." But even granting this interpretation of the term in the first two forms, it seems to us that a person or a thing may be appropriated to God in other senses, besides the sense of church-membership. Human beings may be "born under peculiar relations to God;" yet those relations may not necessarily involve the idea of church-union. Something must exist in the term *ἅγιος* beyond what appears in it, or in its common use, to demand such a sense exclusively.

But, in what sense is the unbelieving husband sanctified by or in (*ἐν*) the wife? We answer, the marriage-union of a heathen man with a Christian woman, or of a heathen woman with a Christian man, in many respects altered the relations of the heathen partner. Such a connection brought the heathen partner into frequent contact with Christians. It awakened in his behalf the interest of the church, and enlisted their prayers. It laid the foundation for his being brought, at least, occasionally, to enjoy the means of grace. Hence, his condition, in some respects, was more hopeful than the condition of a heathen having no relations at all to the Christians. So Rosenmüller interprets the term *ἡγιασται*, "he ceases, in a measure, to be profane and unclean; the way to the privileges of Christianity is more easy to him, etc." Neander, on this passage, says, "The apostle is here treating of the sanctifying influence of the communion between parents and children, by which the children of Christian

parents would be distinguished from the children of those who were not Christian, and in virtue of which they might, in a certain sense, be termed *ἅγιοι* in contrast with the *ἀκάθαρτα*." Olshausen favors the same interpretation. In the words of Dr. Robinson, taken in a guarded sense, "he is to be regarded as belonging to the Christian community;"—not to the Christian church, but to a Christian community, like unconverted persons in evangelical congregations. The interest felt by private Christians and by the church in the believing parent, would produce among them an interest also in his children; and especially, if one of the parents were still heathen, the Christian acquaintances of the other would feel the more concerned for them, lest they should grow up idolaters. And, belonging to a Christian community in this sense, not unclean and hopeless as the children of idolaters around them, the children of such marriages might be denominated *ἅγιοι*. And the apostle, appealing to parental feeling, urged the Christian party, in such a case, to remain with the other, for the sake of the religious influence which might thus be exerted over their children. This relation of the unbelieving partner, bringing him or her into a more hopeful position in respect to salvation, is also urged as an additional reason against the dissolution of the marriage tie.

But, in addition to this, we see not so great an objection as Mr. S. seems to feel, to the explanation of the term *ἅγιος*, as implying, indirectly, the idea of legitimacy. He says that neither Donnegan, Schleusner, nor Wahl, gives the word such an interpretation; and that if we substitute the terms legitimate and illegitimate, for clean and unclean, "we must, in order to be consistent, substitute legitimized for sanctified," in the former part of the text. "Then," he says, "the apostle will reason thus: 'It is an acknowledged fact that the children of parents, one of whom is a Christian and the other not, are legitimate. This proves that the believing parent legitimizes the unbelieving parent—and this is a reason why they should not separate.' But is the idea of one parent legitimizing the other parent, sense or nonsense?" In respect to the testimony of lexicographers as to the meaning of *ἅγιος*, we have no difficulty. Let it mean holy in the sense of ceremonially *clean*, as its position in antithesis with *ἀκάθαρτος*, *unclean*, demands. Then, recalling the well



known fact that an illegitimate child was ceremonially unclean (Deut. 23: 2), it would follow that a child ceremonially clean was legitimate. Thus without any difficulty, and without warping *ἅγιος* from its usual meaning, we come at once upon the idea of legitimacy. And the reasoning of the apostle may be reduced to this: 'You ask if you may lawfully continue in the married state, seeing that one party is a heathen. I answer, yes, for your children are ceremonially clean, i. e. legitimate; and they would be unclean, i. e. illegitimate, if you could not.' Mr. S.'s statement of the supposed absurdity, when he says that the apostle, on this theory, affirms that one parent legitimatizes the other, is unfair. If we choose to use the term 'legitimize,' to which we do not object, the apostle's statement becomes, 'the unbelieving husband has been legitimized (perf. pass.), or made a lawful companion in respect to (*ἐν*) the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife has been made a lawful companion in respect to the believing husband;'—whence, the legitimacy of their children. Is this, so evidently, 'nonsense?' This, indeed accords with what we have been told of the form of marriage commonly used among the Jews. "The man, putting a present into the hand of the woman, says, 'with this thou art *sanctified* to me;' thou art now set apart as my wife, according to God's institution. The verb used in this formula is *קִדַּשׁ*, which precisely corresponds, in Hebrew, to *ἁγιάζω*, in Greek.

Mr. S. adds, that if the apostle designed to speak of the children as legitimate, he must have meant that they were legitimate in a civil or religious sense. But he omits the *ceremonial sense*, which is the only one likely to be in the mind of the apostle or of his anxious brethren. Denying the civil sense, he affirms that the legitimacy implied must be a religious legitimacy, signifying "that the child is the rightful heir of the parents' Christian privileges—in other words, that the child is holy, in the sense soon to be explained." Such a legitimacy, we have already shown sufficiently, the Scriptures no where recognize.

We have spoken thus of the interpretation which maintains that the legitimacy of the marriage connection, and of the children, is the idea referred to in the passage under discussion. We are of opinion, however, that the view which was stated previously is to be preferred. Olshausen, as we have observed, favors the former, while he rejects the latter.

The sense in which the children, in this passage, are called "holy," Mr. S. explains to be "a church-sense—belonging to the people of God, the acknowledged heirs of the parental covenant, entitled to the initiatory rite, which is baptism, and by it constituted members of the church." As these views flow from premises which we deem untenable, having now shown the untenableness of the premises, we may pass over the conclusion without further remark.

In this connection, a few words may be due to another argument for infant church membership, which we find in Dr. Mason "On the Church." It is founded on Rom. 11: 23, 24. "Treating of the future restoration of the Jews, he says, 'They also, if they bide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in, for God is able to graff them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive-tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree.' " Some notice of it is demanded, so much the more, because Mr. S. himself uses the same, in the early part of his volume, in defending the existence and identity of the visible church in both dispensations. Dr. M. affirms that the olive-tree signifies the visible church and the privileges dispensed in it. Alluding to the text, he says,

"These Jews, the natural branches, have been broken off, and thou, the Gentile, grafted in. Grafted into what? The same tree from which the others were cut away. Then, not only is there a visible church, but it is the very same from which the Jews have been excommunicated. . . The Gentiles occupy in the church, the place which the Jews did before their expulsion. The new branch with *its buds* is transferred to the good olive-tree and grows in its fatness. Whatever privileges, therefore, the Jews had formerly, as members of the church of God, all these, at least, their Gentile successors enjoy. But the membership of their infants was one of these privileges, a principal one. Therefore, the children of Gentile believers are members of the Christian church."

The value of this reasoning depends on the question whether the olive-tree, into which the Gentile branches are grafted with their buds, means the visible church of two successive dispensations. We have Dr. M's. affirmation that it does. But we dissent. In our judgment, by the good olive-tree is meant the condition of reconciliation with God and the enjoyment of his favor, the original birthright of the Jews; and by the wild olive-tree, the condition of alienation

from God and rejection by him, to which the Gentiles, as contradistinguished from the chosen nation, were originally subjected. We find nothing said here, necessarily, of a visible church, much less of the 'buds' of Gentile branches, as being grafted into it. In other words, we find spiritual condition described, rather than ecclesiastical relations. Why should the good olive-tree mean "the church and nothing else?" Not from the necessity of the term itself; not from the necessity of the context; but only from the affirmation of a theology, which, certainly in this case, is blind.

While we are alluding to the work of Dr. Mason, it may be well to remark that both his theory and his mode of reasoning, are essentially the same with those of Mr. S. His principal errors are reducible to the following heads. 1. He confounds, in his argument, the two covenants which God made with Abraham, the covenant of circumcision, and the covenant of grace. 2. He supposes the existence of a visible church, under the old dispensation, distinct from the surrounding world, and from the Jewish national economy. 3. He misapprehends the New Testament use of the term "seed," as applicable to the spiritual successors of Abraham, the father of the faithful. 4. He regards the Jewish patent of circumcision the measure of the Christian patent of baptism, viewing the latter ordinance as substituted for the former. 5. He gives an unwarrantable interpretation to the rite of circumcision in the Old Testament, and of baptism in the New, affirming them to be, in all cases, "the seals of the righteousness of faith."

§5. *The argument from other considerations.*

In the fifth section, Mr. S. presents two additional arguments in favor of the church-membership of the children of believers. The first is derived from household-baptisms. But this argument is of no value, unless two things can be shown; 1. That there were young children in the households. 2. That those children were baptized. On both these points, the evidence is defective. So far as the New Testament goes, it guides us to the opinion that the households were households of believers. On this subject, Neander remarks, "We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families; for the passage in 1 Cor. 16 : 15, shows the fallacy of such



a conclusion ; as from that it appears that the whole family of Stéphanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults." We may say the same of the other instances of household-baptism, which Neander has said of this.

The drift of the second argument is that, unless infants are admitted to baptism and church-membership, the Christian economy is much more exclusive than the Jewish. But, be that as it may ; it is ours to accept the Christian economy as Christ has established it; not to mould it into a conformity to an enlarged Judaism, or into such a shape as our own views of what it ought to be may demand. The one was a national system ; the other is a spiritual system. There is so little spirituality among men, that in one point of view, Christianity must be and is the more exclusive. But in another point of view, its claims can be vindicated to the most unfettered benevolence. Judaism conferred its peculiar privileges on one small people. But, under the Christian system, "in every nation, he that fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him."

On the mode of reasoning from the Jewish dispensation to the Christian, Pres. Edwards has the following appropriate remarks :

"Whatever was the case with respect to the qualifications for the sacraments of the old dispensation, I humbly conceive it is nothing to the purpose in the present argument, nor needful to determine us with respect to the qualifications for the sacraments of the Christian dispensation, which is a matter of such plain fact in the New Testament. . . But yet all allow that the Old Testament dispensation is out of date, with its ordinances ; and I think, in a matter pertaining to the constitution and order of the New Testament church, a matter of fact, wherein the New Testament itself is express, full and abundant,—to have recourse to the Mosaic dispensation for rules or precedents to determine our judgment, is quite needless and out of reason. . . Since God uses great plainness of speech in the New Testament, which is, as it were, the charter and municipal law of the Christian church, what need we run back to the ceremonial and typical institutions of an antiquated dispensation, wherein God's declared design was to deliver things in comparative obscurity, hid under a veil, involved in clouds ? We have no more occasion for going to search among the types, dark revelations, and carnal ordinances of the Old Testament, to find out whether this matter of fact concerning the constitution and order of the New Testament church be true, than we have occasion of going there to find out whether any other matter of fact of which we have an account in the New Testament be true."

In the last section of this chapter, our author presents briefly what he denominates "the outlines of the origin,

history and consummation of the church." Going back to Abraham, he shows that certain promises were made to him and his posterity. But at length, the Jewish nation being cast off, the advantages promised descended to the posterity or rightful heirs of Christ. "By the seed of Christ," he remarks, "we understand his spiritual posterity, i. e. all who believe in him throughout the world." On the growth of the believing Gentiles, called wild olive-trees by nature, but now engrafted into Christ, and the final conversion of the Jews, he speaks comprehensively and correctly. In the last paragraph of the section, he departs from the line of exact reasoning, in order to renew the statement that the infant children of believers are to be baptized. He says,

"From the first, God required that a mark of his own appointment should be placed upon his own acknowledged people, upon all who were or were to be *successively* his, by inheritance from generation to generation. This mark was, at first, circumcision. But after the rejection of the unbelieving Jews and the adoption of the believing Gentiles in their place, this mark was changed from circumcision to baptism, which means the same thing. So that baptism is to be applied to the infants of believers, according to the command of God, that his mark should be set upon Abraham and his heirs forever; and all such infants, on receiving baptism, become lambs of the same fold with the parent flock, infant members of the one great church."

In this statement, it is obvious that the conclusion is broader than the premises. The proper form of the argument is as follows: God required a certain badge, circumcision, to be put upon Abraham and upon that posterity of his to which the promises were made. Under the Christian dispensation, a different badge, baptism, is to be put upon Christ and upon that seed of his, to which the promises now belong. That seed is a spiritual seed, or Christians; and, of course, they only are to be baptized. But Mr. S., by what seems to us a strange enlargement of logic, affirms that because circumcision was administered to Abraham and that posterity of his to which the promises were made, therefore, baptism is to be administered to Christians, and, in addition, to their unregenerate offspring, to whom there is no special promise at all.

Thus far we have attended to the supposed argument from Scripture. Having completed our review of that part of the work, the remainder of what we have to say can be brought within a much narrower compass.

§6. *The nature of infant church-membership.*

Mr. S.'s second chapter treats of the nature and degree of infant church-membership. He remarks at the outset, that he has shown that "baptized infants are, strictly speaking, members of the church." This strict church-membership, he proceeds, in the first section, to limit and define. But his definition appears to us, at the best, very confused. It seems both to affirm and deny at the same time. It places baptized children in a certain position, and yet denies that that is the precise position which they hold. He says that baptism "unites the recipients of it, both parents and children, visibly, to Christ, and makes them members of his church,"—that "baptized children are in the same enclosure with the parents, and are equally members of the church, long before they make any personal profession of faith,"—that they are, "strictly speaking, members of the church,"—that they "are admitted by the same door" with their parents, and that they have a "*real* membership" in it. Yet he denies that they are members in full communion, or have a right to participate in the Lord's supper. Yea, when they apply to the church for a recognition of their right to all the privileges of the church, of which they are members equally with their parents, the church may reject them; but, notwithstanding their rejection, "they are still members, they can never cease to be members, except by actual or virtual excommunication." Mr. S. says, as well he may, "Some minds may be so fully possessed with the idea, that joining the church necessarily admits the individual to all the privileges of the church, as to find it difficult to distinguish between *real* membership and membership in full communion." We confess that we find it difficult to discern such a distinction. We can conceive of prospective membership, and of suspended membership, in neither of which the candidate would be entitled to the privileges of the church. But in the case of real membership, we see not by what authority a member is debarred from any of the rights or privileges of the church to which he belongs. We know not by what authority a church rejects from its privileges one whom God has received, who is born in covenant, in respect to whom the covenant is sealed by baptism, and who is now a lamb of the Saviour's fold, a member of the church equally with his believing



parent. Mr. S. attempts to exhibit the difference between real membership, and membership in full communion, in two or three illustrations ; but they are all imperfect. As a specimen of them, he says, "Are there not sometimes infant kings, who are not as yet invested with all royal prerogatives?—real kings, but not in complete standing?"—an illustration in point to our purpose, but not to his. For their being kings prospectively only, is equivalent to their being, at present, not kings at all. But, as we have before observed, it seems to us that there is no middle position of the kind here supposed. A person is a church-member, or he is not. If he is, he is entitled to all the peculiar immunities and privileges of a member ; and if, on any account, he is not entitled to the peculiar privileges of a member, then he is, in point of fact, not a member.

The second section is on the treatment due from the church to its baptized children. Mr. S. comprehends the whole under two heads, supervision and discipline. The substance of what he says under the first is, that the church should watch over its children, and when they fall into open sin, mourn over, pray for, and seek to reclaim them. This is all that the church is to do for them. But we ask, are not Christians, as Christians, under obligation so to seek the spiritual good of all children and adult persons within their reach? If they are, then their membership in the church does the children of the church little good. They would be entitled to all that the church does for them, out of the church, as truly as within it ; and thus the benefits of their membership are a mere nullity. Under the head of discipline, he says, that in case the baptized child is guilty of unchristian conduct, he is to be expostulated with successively by his parents, and pastor, and his case to be laid before the church, or if the church be large, before a select few, for the purpose of securing their advice and prayers. All this might be done, without supposing the child's membership in the church. But, he adds, in case a child, having arrived at an age capable of acting for himself, pursues a course of conduct which amounts to a renunciation of his church-membership, after suitable means have been used for his recovery, if no hope of amendment remains, "there could be no impropriety in removing him from the church." This, however, he would have done with the utmost secrecy ; for

"some lawful things," he remarks, "the apostle teaches us, are inexpedient." "Perhaps," he says, "on account of the hardness of men's hearts, as society is now constituted, it might be wiser, if any, once lambs of the fold, should fall into what seems irreclaimable sin, and thus renounce their baptismal covenant, silently, and by informal consent to consider and treat them as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, rather than separate them from the church by any direct excommunicating act." But such an act of withdrawal is to be deferred, in the hope of indications of repentance, "one year, or ten, or, under some circumstances, till the individual is excommunicated by death;" and it must never take place in respect to persons who sustain a good character, and manifest a serious regard for the obligations of religion. In respect to these points, we say the apostle nowhere says it is inexpedient to perform the lawful act of withdrawing church-fellowship from the wicked, but exactly the contrary (1 Cor. 5: 11. 2 Cor. 6: 17). In respect to the matter of excommunication, we beg leave also to ask, if the church's extreme act of discipline be designed to reform the offender, why this act should be so secret and informal that neither the church, nor the pastor, nor the world, nor the individual himself shall know, whether the act has taken place or not? How can such covert discipline benefit the offender? If the children, first by birth, and then by baptism, are made *bona fide* church-members, the acts of the church concerning them ought to be formal acts. The church-members ought to know who are their brethren and sisters in church-relationship; they ought to have the means of acting harmoniously towards a given individual, as a member in good standing, or as an excommunicated person; the church register ought to show who are, and who are not its members; and if any names are removed by an act of discipline, it should be by vote of the whole body. But in the silent discipline here advocated, all this is out of the question. We have also a remark to offer on the length of time which must elapse, before such a withdrawal takes place. It seems to us that, if this matter of church-membership be a serious one, and not a mere shadow, it is inconsistent and unworthy for a church to hold in acknowledged membership, for ten, or twenty, or thirty years, members who do not come to the Lord's table, and who would not be suffered to

come, if they desired to do so, and who are evidently and confessedly unregenerate. Why should a church, desiring universal purity, tolerate such a plan? Is that which is here described the New Testament law of church discipline? Is it the discipline that was used in the apostolic churches? Or is it an unscriptural system of church action, based on an unscriptural expediency?

We can scarcely avoid a sense of the absurdity of our author's theory, when, in conformity with it, he recommends that baptized children, in going from one town to another, should carry with them testimonials of character and church-membership, introducing them to the church with which they intend to worship; and that, in case a "baptized person proposes himself for public profession, in some other church than that to which he properly belongs, testimonials of character, and a certificate of church-standing should be required, as always indispensable to an orderly reception."

The third section describes other privileges of baptized children. The substance of the whole is that baptized children are a great deal better off, not to say, a great deal better, than unbaptized children. Every sentence except three or four, in this section of three pages, strikes us as unscriptural and indefensible. "The baptized," he says, "have been received as members of the kingdom—to be educated in its institutions and fitted for its services,—though liable, on account of unbelief, to be thrust out of it. The unbaptized are not members of the kingdom, though they may be admitted by the exercise of saving faith." It seems almost as if the baptized children were to be brought up, pious and regenerate, without ever becoming regenerate. One can scarcely read this section without doubting whether baptized children are even originally depraved.

The fourth section describes the restrictions upon church-privileges to which baptized children are subject. The author says, "Baptized non-professors, though members of the church, are not, however, entitled to full communion, nor to the rights of suffrage in the church, nor to baptism for their children." In respect to the first, he says, "they have neither the right nor the qualifications to participate with their parents in the supper of the Lord." Yet, this restriction is not inconsistent with their membership. This he proposes to illustrate, by saying that "pastors are church-



members, but all church-members are not pastors. Deacons are church-members, but all church-members are not deacons." But the illustrations appear to us to involve a sophism. Church-membership, as we reason, involves the right to certain privileges flowing out of it, of which one certainly is, the right to participate in the ordinances of the church. This is an *ex necessitate* result of church-union. But the pastorate or the deaconship is not an *ex necessitate* result of church-union. If they were, then it would follow that every church-member has a right to be pastor or deacon. The illustrations are plainly imperfect.

Mr. S. here affirms a distinction between baptism and the Lord's supper, by virtue of which he thinks that baptized children are to be excluded from the latter. But we ask in vain for scriptural testimony, that partaking of one of the ordinances is any more a personal act than partaking of the other. The scriptural qualifications for baptism certainly indicate that it is a personal act, as much as the scriptural qualifications for the Lord's supper. The scriptural import of baptism—a profession of dying to sin and rising to newness of life (Rom. 6: 3—6. Col. 2: 12, 13)—indicates that it is a personal act. The covenant engagements which it involves, and which cannot, scripturally, be performed by any proxy, indicate that it is the personal act of a voluntary agent, precisely the same as the covenant engagements involved in the participation in the sacramental communion. It may be said of both ordinances, as he says of the latter, "Infants and very young children are excluded from the Lord's table by the very nature of the ordinance; nor can they be welcomed, until they possess both requisite knowledge and faith."

The most important point in this section is in the remarks on the principle that baptized non-professors are not entitled to the baptism of their children. It is very evident that evil consequences might arise to the purity of the church, if they were permitted to bring their children to this ordinance. But the question of their right as church-members has nothing to do with the result of it. That evil may, perhaps, arise from the exercise of a right is no proof that that right does not exist. If it is the will of God that unconverted persons should be in the church, he will be responsible for the consequences. And, if there is danger

that the baptized children of non-professors would "perpetuate irreligion in the church," there is exactly the same danger that the baptized children of professors would do it. So that if the argument would exclude the one from baptism, it would exclude the other for the same reason, and thus infant baptism would cease.

In an attempt to show that the children of non-professors cannot be admitted to baptism, Mr. S. says, substantially, that, by the failure of the latter, by an open profession "to lay hold upon the covenant by faith, and to take upon themselves their baptismal vows," they are virtually excluded from the covenant. "The chain is broken, the covenant is annulled." And, therefore, they have lost the right of bringing their children to baptism. But it should be remembered, 1. that they are still in the church, unless a formal or understood excommunication has taken place, and, therefore, they still remain in covenant. 2. The covenant was conditioned, not on their prospective piety, but on the faith of their parents; and, this latter remaining intact, the profligacy of the child cannot annul the covenant made with reference to a wholly different condition. The condition of the parent's faith being met, the child introduced into covenant with God on account of it, remains in covenant, irrespective of any conditions on his own part. Hence the unconverted parent remaining in covenant, we see not why his children should be excluded from baptism, any more than the children of professed believers.

Again, he remarks that "baptism, like circumcision, is a seal of the righteousness of faith. In the case of infant baptism, it is a seal of the parent's faith, placed not only upon himself, but, on his account, upon the child. If the parent gives no evidence of faith, the seal placed upon his child is a seal of that which has neither actual nor visible existence. Baptism, under such circumstances, is a manifest absurdity." The error that circumcision was a seal of the righteousness of faith, we have already shown. It was a seal of the righteousness which Abraham had; but the Scriptures do not teach us that it was the seal of the righteousness of all other persons who were circumcised. We readily grant, in reference to this particular case, that if baptism be the seal or token of a parent's faith, it cannot be administered to a child on account of the parent's faith,

if the parent has no faith. But we ask, in what terms, and where does the New Testament teach that baptism, applied to a given individual, is the seal of the faith of another individual, who is not baptized?

He says also, "the very formula of baptism implies the supposed pre-existence of faith on the part of the parent." But we certainly see nothing in the formula of baptism, implying the pre-existence of faith in the parents of the person to whom baptism is administered. And if such an implication do not exist in the formula itself, we have no right to use it in a connection, where it shall speak any other than its plain meaning. We have no right thus to add any thing to the divine canon. Indeed, under the Christian dispensation, we are not aware that any act involving moral feelings, and baptism is essentially such an act, can be vicarious. But if the faith can be vicarious, why may not the baptism, so that the parent shall be baptized many times, instead of bringing his successive children to the altar?—especially since the one is a moral quality, and the other only an outward ordinance? If, moreover, on the basis of faith in his parent, a child of a few days or months old may be baptized, then a child may be baptized on the same ground, who is a little older, or a little older still; and so on, indefinitely, for aught that appears, to any age; as he will be no more truly unregenerate at fifty, than he is at ten, or three years of age. If the faith of the believing party is the ground on which the ordinance is administered, why may not any unbeliever be baptized on the faith of any believer? Especially, since the covenant runs—"to thee and to thy seed"—we see no reason at all why the grandchildren, or remote descendants of a believer may not be baptized on his faith. If the Jewish patent is the basis of the Christian, there can be no reason why the latter should be made, in respect certainly to unconscious babes, any more exclusive than the former.

By the principle which Mr. S. lays down, in reasoning on this part of his subject, he seems to confine the broad terms of the covenant, "I will be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee,"—to a single generation, to the immediate children of the believing parent; since, unless they become Christians, the covenant relation descends no further in the line of the family. Nay, more than this, the extension of



the blessings of this covenant beyond a single generation, on this principle, depends not upon the parent's faith, but upon the faith of his child; and, still worse, if the immediate child do not become a believer, he is shut out of the blessings promised, and the word of God to the believing parent becomes of none effect.

In his third chapter, Mr. S. exhibits the practical advantages of the doctrine of infant church-membership. This chapter contains some remarks of a deeply interesting and affecting character, and entirely in harmony with the views of all Christians. But there are, also, some statements which we ought not wholly to pass by. Under his first head, Mr. S. says that, as a result of the doctrine of infant church-membership, children "will be less exposed to grow up and abide among us, as a non-descript, half-christianized population, the Samaritans of Christianity, likely enough to become our bitterest enemies in the end." The book, in general, as we have remarked, is written in an excellent spirit; but we must regard this sentence as involving a most uncourteous description of the children of the author's own denomination, and of other Christian sects, who have not been presented at the baptismal altar. We take leave, also to remark, that the evils alluded to, will, after all, be obviated, not by infant baptism, but by Christian instruction, accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit. The author proceeds, under the same head, to say, that "by this initiatory rite, the subjects of it are solemnly introduced among the number of Christ's disciples—they are invested with the rights of Christian citizenship,"—yet he denies them the right of suffrage, one of the most precious privileges of citizenship. He says further, "if they are preserved to adult years, having now a visible growth upon the good olive-tree, in the garden of the Lord, etc." But what is the nature of this spiritual growth? Are confessedly unregenerate persons engrafted by baptism into the good olive-tree? And have they obtained a visible growth upon the good olive-tree, previously to their becoming regenerate? "Baptism," he adds, "is not to them nor to any a saving ordinance; but it is wonderfully preparatory to that efficacious grace which saves the soul." If this passage does not describe baptism as a means of grace, we know not how to understand it. But this is not merely erroneous in point of fact; it is giving

to baptism a new meaning, and ascribing to it a new efficacy, inconsistent with the meaning and efficacy ascribed to it in all the preceding parts of his work. To use the words of Mr. Stoddard,—

“Whatever tendency ordinances have, in their own nature, to be serviceable to men, yet they will not prevail any further than God doth bless them. . . There is reason to hope for a divine blessing on the Lord’s supper, when it is administered to those that it ought to be administered to. God’s blessing is to be expected in God’s way. If men act according to their own humours and fancies, and do not keep in the way of obedience, it is presumption to expect God’s blessing, Matt. 15: 9, ‘In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.’”

The fourth chapter shows very successfully that the church-membership of infants has been the prevailing doctrine of the Congregational churches of New England from the beginning; and at the same time that this doctrine laid the foundation for some corruptions, which opened upon the churches the flood-gates of irreligion. Mr. S. maintains, however, that these corruptions sprang from a misapprehension of the proper limitations of the doctrine, rather than from the doctrine itself. Most of the authorities quoted, civil and ecclesiastical, agree with Mr. S., in regarding baptized children as members of particular churches, of the same churches with their parents. Some of them agree with Dr. Dwight, in regarding them “as members of the church general, but not of a particular church.”

The work of Mr. S. has led us to examine anew the grounds of our own faith, and to weigh afresh the arguments of the opposite system. The re-examination has strengthened our confidence in the system delivered to us by our fathers, and, as we firmly believe, taught by Christ and the apostles.

## ARTICLE II.

## PRESIDENT MAXCY'S REMAINS.

*The Literary Remains of the Rev. JONATHAN MAXCY, D. D., second President of Brown University, R. I.: late President of Union College, N. Y.: and of South Carolina College, S. C. With a Memoir of his life: by ROMEO ELTON, D. D. pp. 452. New York. 1844.*

CONSIDERING the high standing of President Maxcy, it is remarkable that his Literary Remains should now be published for the first time. He was successively at the head of three respectable American colleges, and in his day was one of the most eloquent and accomplished men, considered both as a preacher and a scholar, of whom our denomination could boast. His numerous pupils, scattered as they have been, all over the land, have borne far and wide the praises of his gentle virtues and commanding eloquence. Yet, strange to say, not one of them has ever attempted a memoir of his life, or a collection of his published discourses; and his name, in consequence, has come to be seldom mentioned, save in the limited circles, in which a few of his personal admirers still linger and keep it in remembrance.

This is, doubtless, owing in part to the fact that he was never, but for a short time, the pastor of a church; and was principally known as a minister and a theologian, by the occasional discourses which he was called to preach. He was thus but slightly connected with the public interests and the religious activities of the denomination to which he belonged. He was, however, as were his ancestors before him, truly and sincerely a Baptist, though a liberal and catholic one, and was associated in frequent interviews and familiar friendship with Stillman and Smith—with Backus and Baldwin, at that time the honored leaders of the denomination in New England.

But this unfortunate neglect of Dr. Maxcy's memory, we fear, must be ascribed still more to the almost habitual indifference which Baptists have hitherto manifested to the char-



acters and the fame of their fathers and departed worthies. Many a name, associated with the truest piety and the noblest clerical virtues, has been suffered to go quietly down to oblivion, for want of some pen to record the labors, the struggles and triumphs of him to whom it belongs. The history of our denomination, could it be faithfully written, would be found to present many a chasm, which it is now too late to fill up with authentic narrative.

It is mortifying to think that we have allowed men like Clarke and Callender, Backus and Manning—each of them an honored and true-hearted advocate of the faith which we profess, at a time when this faith was despised and derided over the greater part of New England—to pass away so nearly from the memory of men. They were all scholars, who compared well with the foremost of their time. Some of them, also, have linked their names with the history of the country, by the services they rendered in the days of her early settlements, and her subsequent struggles for national independence. But no one of them has found among their own brethren a biographer to set forth their labors and sacrifices, and to delineate their characters in connection with the peculiar faith which they professed. Their lives, in some instances, at least, were filled with important events, which illustrated the civil and religious character of the age to which they belong. They were made beautiful, too, by their simple manners, their all-enduring faith, their deep devotion to truth. It is sad to think that their memory has so nearly perished, and it is humiliating to reflect that this would have been permitted in no other denomination than our own. It is certainly time that we gave more attention to the past,—that our ministers studied more faithfully the history of the denomination, and especially the early records of their older churches,—that our institutions of learning were more careful to honor the memory of their fathers and founders, and to treasure up all that pertains to their history, and that our scholars and writers were at greater pains to enshrine in the living forms of literature, the character and spirit of the worthy dead, who rest from their labors and whose works do follow them.

The brief memoir which is prefixed to the discourses in the volume before us, is of itself, a sufficient justification of the complaint we utter in these remarks. It is to be sup-

posed that Dr. Elton, the learned editor of these Remains, enjoying as he did every advantage that could be desired, spared no pains to collect the materials for the biographical part of his work. Yet after all that he has done, we find that eighteen introductory pages are sufficient to contain all that now remains of the life and labors of President Maxcy. We are able to learn from them little else than the most obvious facts of his earthly existence. The date of his birth, the place of his youthful education, the posts he successively filled in his manhood, and the time and the place of his death, are nearly all that can be told of one who, in his day, was celebrated as an eloquent and learned divine, and whom hundreds of youth, the best and brightest, from different portions of the country, delighted to acknowledge "their guide, philosopher and friend." His inner life, the workings of his mind, the influences that made him what he was, and the influences which he exerted on others,—all that goes to make up his real character and most important history, it would seem, has, even so soon, perished beyond recovery.

From this brief and inadequate sketch, however, we proceed to give, so well as we may, the most interesting facts of his life, and to set forth such features of his character as we are able to discern in the discourses which the volume contains.

JONATHAN MAXCY was born in Attleborough, Massachusetts, September 2, 1768. His parents and grandparents were farmers of respectable standing in the community to which they belonged; and his mother especially, who was a member of the Baptist church in his native town, spared no pains to rear him, from a tender age, in the practice of virtue and the fear of God. He early gave proofs of superior endowments, and was destined by his parents for a liberal education and for professional life. At a suitable age he was, accordingly, placed under the tuition of Rev. William Williams, of Wrentham, at that time an eminent instructor. The pupils of this worthy man were exceedingly numerous, and were widely scattered over the country. A few of them still remain to recall his venerable form, and bear witness to the goodness of his heart and his fidelity as a teacher, both in classical and theological learning. Under the guidance of Mr. Williams, young Maxcy pursued the Latin and Greek studies, which were then prescribed as the preparation for

admission to college, and commenced that course of intellectual discipline which was to terminate in usefulness and distinction. In 1783, when fifteen years of age, he entered Brown University, as a member of the Freshmen class. Here he came immediately under the instruction of President Manning, and of the Hon. Asher Robbins, at that time just entering upon his tutorship in the college. In these accomplished and distinguished gentlemen, he found instructors admirably qualified to develop the powers of his aspiring and brilliant mind, and to urge him forward to the highest distinctions of college scholarship. His own tastes, as well as the instructions prevalent at that time in the University, inclined him particularly to the study of belles-lettres; and he became distinguished among the undergraduates as the most accomplished orator and writer of his time. He graduated in 1787, with the highest honors of his class; and, somewhat aside from the modern usage, delivered along with his valedictory oration, a poem "On the Prospects of America." Immediately on his graduation, he was appointed to the office of Tutor in the college,—a distinction which stimulated him to still higher aspirations for intellectual excellence. It was while thus situated, as a junior instructor within the quiet retreats of his alma mater, that he became a decidedly religious man, and joined the first Baptist church in Providence, at that time under the care of Rev. President Manning.

Of his precise religious views at this period of his life, or of the subsequent growth of his religious character, we find in the memoir before us, no means of judging. He, doubtless, was regarded with full confidence, by his brethren of the church; for in 1790, he was licensed to preach as a minister of the gospel, and soon after, on the resignation of Dr. Manning, was invited by the church to supply their vacant pulpit, for a number of months. "In this new and important station," says Dr. Elton, "he shone with the greatest brilliancy. Possessing an active, vigorous, and comprehensive mind, his faculties were continually improving by diligence and application. He soon attained a high reputation as a preacher; and such was the opinion that church entertained of his talents and piety, that in the following year, he was invited to take the pastoral charge. After mature deliber-



ation, he resigned his tutorship, and accepted that important and respectable station."

He was ordained pastor of the church in Providence, September 8, 1791; and on the same day, he received the appointment of Professor of Divinity in the college. This professorship lasted but for a single year, and it is not known that he discharged any other than nominal duties during its continuance. "It has been questioned," says Judge Pitman, in his late address to the Alumni of the University, "whether such a professorship is consistent with the college charter. It was probably devised as a temporary expedient, as a probation for the presidency; for, after the election of Mr. Maxcy to the presidency, it was silently abolished."

Mr. Maxcy's ministry with the church at Providence, though of short duration, was yet a happy, and, in many respects, an eminently successful one. It was a period in which he acquired a high reputation both as a preacher and a pastor, and exerted an influence upon the church and upon the town, which was felt throughout the entire community. The duties of his ministry he discharged with earnest devotion to his work, and with a high and generous conception of what a Christian minister ought to be. "His sermons," says Dr. Elton, "were prepared with great care and accuracy, and delivered in a manner so chaste, dignified and impressive, that they were always heard with profound attention and delight. In his pulpit addresses and pastoral visitations, he delighted in administering balm to the sorrowful, and in teaching the desponding where to look for consolation."

Just before the settlement of Mr. Maxcy, while he was still engaged in supplying the pulpit at Providence, the presidency of the college had become vacant by the sudden and lamented death of Dr. Manning, who expired at his post on Friday, the twenty-ninth of July, 1791. An event so unexpected, so important in its bearings on the interests of the institution which he had founded, and watched over with unwearied assiduity for twenty-six years, seems to have filled the hearts of its friends with perplexity and dismay. By the charter of the college, the president must be a Baptist; and they looked around among the older ministers of the denomination for one whose learning and experience would qualify

him for the high and honorable post: but none was found. The office continued vacant till the commencement of 1792; and two classes of graduates, that of 1791 and that of 1792, received their degrees from a president appointed specially for the occasion of the commencement anniversary. During this period, the choice of the Corporation became fixed on the young and gifted pastor of the first Baptist church. He was elected to the presidency on the eighth of September, 1792; and on the same day resigned the pastorship, and entered immediately on his duties at the college. Of the manner in which he discharged those duties, we quote the following description from the Memoir before us.

“Hence his popular career commenced under the most favorable auspices. At the Commencement succeeding his inauguration, the college was illuminated, and a transparency was placed in the attic story displaying his name, with—‘President 24 years old.’ The University, over which he presided with distinguished honor to himself and benefit to the public, flourished under his administration, and his fame was extended over every section of the Union. The splendor of his genius, and his brilliant talents as an orator and divine, were seen and admired by all. Between the President and his associates in office, there was an intercourse of mind and feeling the most harmonious and delightful. He had nothing of that dictatorial, imperious and overbearing spirit, which persons who are elevated to power, are too apt to assume. He endeared himself to the students by his courteous and conciliatory manners, and his paternal solicitude for their welfare; while his various and exact knowledge, sound judgment, refined taste and impressive eloquence, commanded their respect and supported his authority. President Maxcy beautifully exemplified the maxim,—

‘*Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes,  
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse ferus.*’”

In the new sphere to which he was thus introduced, at a period of life when many of his pupils must have been his equals in years, he labored with an assiduity and a judicious zeal, that did not fail to secure the most valuable results in the increasing prosperity and fame of the University. From the accounts of the administration of the presidency, which we have often heard from his surviving pupils, he would seem to have been possessed, to an unusual degree, of that power of attaching others to his person, which is always so essential to those who would easily govern mankind, whether in the shades of the academy, or amid the bustle of cabinets and camps. He was largely endowed with that nameless charm of character and of manner, which enabled him to conciliate without condescension, and to control without the

assertion of authority. His pupils evinced for him the most delicate respect, and bore away with them into the scenes of active life, a vivid impression of the accomplished president, whose eloquence had enforced the precepts of science, and whose amiable manners had won their affections during their residence at the University. The power which he thus put forth, and which is so often spoken of as an attribute of eminent instructors, is not a matter to be analyzed and described, nor can it be acquired by every man on any general principles that can be laid down. It is as much a gift of nature, as is brilliant imagination or strong reason.

On the subject of academic discipline, we cannot but regard the views indicated by the learned editor of this volume, as somewhat too pleasant to be exactly just. It seems to imply that the government and decorum of a college community can, in all cases, be maintained by appealing to the "understanding, the magnanimity and the conscience" of its members; and that pupils of whatever age, and whatever degree of social and moral cultivation, can always be stimulated to intellectual exertion, and restrained from indolence and vice by being simply "addressed and treated as young gentlemen." In the present state of human nature, we greatly fear that this is too agreeable to be true. While we hold that the principles of generous co-operation and reciprocal confidence should constitute the basis alike of instruction and government, both in the school and college, we yet believe that other principles must be held in reserve, and used whenever the frequently recurring exigency shall require. Young men are certainly as likely to be wrong-headed and wrong-hearted, as men of maturer years; and no principles of courtesy and confidence have yet been found adequate to secure the order and harmony of civil society. And we may greatly err, if we expect them to be so much more efficacious in the family or the academy. Fortunate and happy indeed—*ter quaterque beatus*—is that instructor, who has never been obliged to bestow his unrequited labors upon pupils to whom the term "young gentlemen" was alike inapplicable and unmeaning.

President Maxcy was indebted for his superior power of moulding the sentiments and controlling the conduct of young men, not to his more correct views of human character, or of the ends of education, but to the fortunate temperament with



which nature had endowed him. His pupils became attached to his person and his character, and yielded themselves to his authority as a thing of course.

Mr. Maxcy continued at the head of Rhode Island College, as Brown University was then called, from 1792 to 1802, a period of ten years, during which the college made very considerable advancement, both in its means of education and in the number of its students. During the presidency of Dr. Manning, which continued twenty-six years, the number added to the lists of its alumni was one hundred and sixty-five; but such was the growth of the institution, that during the ten years of Dr. Maxcy's presidency, one hundred and twenty-seven graduates received their diplomas from his hand. The manner in which he discharged the duties of his office, and the relations which he maintained with the community, in days when educated men were comparatively few, were such as endeared him not only to every department of the college, but to the citizens of the town and of the whole State. One of his distinguished pupils, in the address already alluded to, says of him, that "He was a most acceptable president. He did not possess such a commanding person as Dr. Manning; but he was a man of great dignity, and grace in his manner and deportment, and his countenance was full of intellectual beauty. His musical voice, graceful action, and harmonious periods will not soon be forgotten by those of us who belong to that era of the college which is connected with his presidency."

The reputation of Mr. Maxcy, as an instructor and as a man of letters, was soon well established and widely extended. In the year 1801, when but thirty-three years of age, he received from Harvard College the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity, a testimonial of respect from a sister institution which he well merited, and which his subsequent career continued fully to justify. On the death of Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D. D., president of Union College, in New York, he was appointed to the vacant post at the head of that institution. He decided to accept the appointment; and in September 1802, resigned his office at Providence, and removed with his family to Schenectady. Of the success which he attained while presiding over this institution, we have no adequate means of judging. He remained here but for two years, at the end of which period, on the

opening of the college at Columbia, South Carolina, he received the unsolicited appointment of its overseers to the office of President. Influenced by the hope of recruiting in a southern clime, the energies of a constitution too delicate to endure the confinement of a studious life at the north, he resolved on another removal. Accordingly, in 1804, he resigned his post at Schenectady, and entered upon the new sphere of academic instruction, which was assigned him as the head of the South Carolina College.

The administration of this office was marked by the same traits, and the same success, as had already characterized the early periods of his career as a college instructor. The institution over whose infancy he was called to watch, grew rapidly in the public favor; and beneath the mild and popular government of Dr. Maxcy, rose to a rank scarcely equalled by any of the colleges at that time in existence, south of the Potomac. The young men of that State, always sensible to the charms, and ambitious of the reputation, of eloquence, were delighted with the fascinating oratory of their president, and eagerly imitated the model which he constantly presented before them.

Over this institution, he continued to preside with distinguished reputation till the period of his death. The influence of his character, however, was by no means limited to the shades of the academy. He lived at the capital of a State, which, alike in the earlier and the later periods of the republic, has been distinguished for her legislators and statesmen—her scholars and divines. With many of them Dr. Maxcy was on terms of intimate association; and the power of his character could not fail to be felt in the eminent circles in which he moved. He was also in the South, quite as much as he had been in the North, identified with the interests of the Christian denomination to which he belonged; and some of the most favorable specimens of his pulpit eloquence, in the volume before us, are the sermons he delivered on different occasions while resident at Columbia.

Dr. Maxcy died on the fourth of June, 1820, at the age of 52 years. At the time of his death, he was still in the full maturity of his powers, and in the meridian of his usefulness, and fame. The melancholy event spread a cloud of sorrow over the elevated sphere in which he moved, and was

mourned by the friends of learning and religion who had enjoyed his acquaintance, throughout the land. His funeral was publicly solemnized,—an eloquent tribute was offered to his memory in an eulogium pronounced upon his character and services, by Professor Henry, who had been one of his associates in the college; and “his remains were borne to the silent house appointed for all the living, upon the shoulders of his disconsolate pupils, by whom this great and good man was so affectionately beloved and revered.”

Dr. Maxcy, it is stated in the Memoir, was elected to the presidency of a college, and continued to hold the office for a larger proportion of his life than any other person in the United States. Out of the fifty-two years of his life, he passed thirty-seven in connection with a college, either as pupil or instructor; and of them, not less than twenty-eight, were spent in the office of president. He was, therefore, in his associations, pre-eminently an academic man; and was said, at the time of his death, to have enjoyed “a reputation higher, perhaps, than that of any other president of a college in the United States.” His life was devoted to the profession of instruction; and it is as an instructor, that he mainly deserves to be considered. To his excellence in this capacity, the high reputation which he acquired, and the united voice of all his living pupils, bear unequivocal testimony. Teaching, especially in the department of eloquence and elegant literature, was undoubtedly his chief delight: and his clear conception, quick invention, and ready communication admirably qualified him for his chosen work. It was by the exercise of these powers, and by his singular grace of manner, and rare felicity of expression, that he acquired the high reputation which he possessed, as an instructor. Without these powers in an expounder of science, the lessons of education, whether in the school or the college, can seldom awaken the interest, or rouse to original and independent action, the mind of the pupil. While he who possesses them in any high degree, will rarely fail of eminence in the difficult work of teaching the young.

In considering Dr. Maxcy as a scholar, we can, however, hardly agree to the high estimate which the editor of his Remains has given of his attainments. At least, we look in vain for the evidence that “he was one of the most learned men which (whom?) our country has produced.” That he



was a scholar, and in some sense, a good and ripe one, cannot be called in question; but his attainments, respectable as they were, must yet be considered as rather varied and elegant, than as profound and exact. He was not what can be called the master of any particular science or branch of learning; yet he was entirely a stranger to none. He was familiar with classical literature, with philosophy, theology and criticism; but he never gave himself up with singleness of aim to the attainment of high excellence in either. He delighted to range at will over every field of learning, and pluck the fruits, and gather the flowers that he met by the way, that he thus might adorn his character and enrich his instructions; but we cannot see that he had any conception of that protracted and secluded study—that earnest, life-long devotion to a single class of intellectual pursuits, which is really necessary to make a man a thorough and finished scholar, or even to render him “one of the most learned men whom our country has produced.” Indeed his labors as an instructor did not demand this at his hands; and his situation was not in any high degree, favorable to producing it. This may seem paradoxical to those who are accustomed to think of the president of a college as having nothing to do, but amass learning as a bee gathers honey.

“Hiving wisdom through each studious hour.”

Few, however, who have looked with a close scrutiny upon the wide range of duties to which his attention is daily demanded, will be surprised at the suggestion.

In the exposition of science, however, Dr. Maxcy was eminently successful. As a writer and an orator, he may compare well with many of his most distinguished contemporaries. He was largely gifted with imagination and facility of utterance, that enabled him, as Gibbon has said of the Greeks, “to give a soul to the objects of sense, and a body to the abstractions of philosophy.” As with most successful orators, it was his habit to reason in metaphors—to embody abstract thoughts in beautiful images, and to clothe the deductions of logic with the ornaments of taste, and the colorings of fancy. It is this attribute of his mind, which, to our apprehension, is best illustrated in the discourses which are collected in this volume of *Remains*. They are not distinguished for profundity of reasoning or

originality of views, or nicety of discrimination; but they every where exhibit a happy power of statement, and a singular felicity of illustration. His exuberant fancy sometimes, indeed, bears him beyond the bounds of strict propriety, and pours itself forth in a superabundance of imagery, which a correct taste would hardly sanction. But this is the exception to the general rule. The style is usually not only rich and flowing, but also sufficiently chastened, and suited to the subject of which he may be treating. But Dr. Maxcy's power as an orator, is not to be attributed to his richness of style alone. If we may trust the fervid eulogium of another\* of his pupils and friends, who has himself won the laurels of eloquence in many a field of stern debate, he very far excelled most other public speakers in gracefulness of action and in the "enchancing attribute of utterance." "The eloquence of Maxcy," says he, "was mental. You seemed to hear the soul of the man; and each one of the largest assembly, in the most extended place of worship, received the slightest impulse of his silver voice, as if he stood at his very ear. So entirely would he enchain attention, that in the most thronged audience, you heard nothing but him, and the pulsations of your own heart." If he could wield such power "of sweet and solemn sound," in addition to his lucid richness of language, we are at no loss to account for the celebrity he acquired as a pulpit orator, even though we find in his services but few proofs of pre-eminent learning and profound argumentation. In this respect, Dr. Maxcy may well be regarded as a model for the preachers of our own time. He cultivated the exquisite tones of the human voice, and studied with careful attention, all the proprieties of delivery. The cultivated ear was never pained at his utterance, nor was the most delicate taste ever shocked by rude familiarity or abrupt vehemence, or undignified recklessness in his manner. As he rose in the pulpit, the assembly was hushed to solemn stillness, and all hearts were subdued to that devout frame which becomes the house of God. It would seem as though the qualities in which he excelled, and which gave him his highest powers, were now almost universally neglected by those who speak from the pulpit. Where now in our denomination, are the preachers

---

\* Hon. Tristram Burgess, in his Oration before the Society of Federal Adelpi of Brown University, Sept. 9th, 1831.

who cultivate "the attribute of utterance," or who aspire, in any degree, to the oratory in which Maxcy excelled? Where shall we find that calm earnestness of manner, that studied observance of every propriety in all the exercises of the pulpit, which should characterize the house of God, and distinguish it from every other place in which orators speak, or the people assemble to hear? It cannot but be admitted that all these things have fallen into sad neglect; and that the power of the pulpit over the minds of men has, in consequence, lamentably declined. The *beau ideal* of the true orator is no where better set forth than in the language in which Dr. Johnson has made Rasselas describe the sage, whom he met at Cairo. "He speaks, and attention watches his lips. He reasons, and conviction closes his periods." Such power can be approached only by studying the master-models of eloquence, by observing with care all that can rouse or subdue the human heart, and especially by cultivating the deeper sensibilities of one's own nature, and teaching them to flow forth in the unaffected tones of rich and harmonious utterance.

The volume before us contains twenty-four discourses; under the different names of sermons, orations, and baccalaureate addresses, which were published during the life of Dr. Maxcy. They furnish abundant proof of the enlightened views and the liberal spirit of their author, respecting all the subjects and interests of which he treats. In politics, he was strongly attached to the Federal constitution, and the republican institutions of which it contains the guaranty. Like many of the more hopeful and ardent spirits of his age, both in our own and other countries, we find him, near the commencement of the French revolution, in an oration on the fourth of July, expressing some sympathy with its progress. But that tragedy of atheism and blood, of ferocious anarchy and barbarian revenge, had not proceeded far, before he discovered its true character; and, in an oration delivered on a similar occasion, a few years later, he denounces the French republic, in a paragraph of burning invective, which may well compare with the best passages of Robert Hall's celebrated "Sermon before the Volunteers."

On the great questions of theology, he appears to have held the views of the Calvinistic churches of the denomination to which he belonged. But the more difficult and



frowning aspects which these views are sometimes made to wear, he seems habitually to have avoided. His nature was too mild for unnecessary severities; and his sense of the importance of practical religion, too deep and abiding, to allow him to indulge in useless subtleties. The distinctive features of Christianity he cherished with an earnest faith, such as a heart-felt experience of their value and their fitness to the wants of human nature, so naturally inspires. Of all his published sermons, none, probably, are more clearly expressed or more forcibly reasoned, than the two on "the doctrine of the atonement," preached in the chapel of Rhode Island College on the eleventh and twenty-fifth of November, 1796, while presiding over that institution. This great subject is there drawn out with admirable clearness, and illustrated with earnest eloquence, such as could not fail to have impressed its leading features upon the young men, who, in that infidel age, were assembled within the walls of Rhode Island College. These discourses also possess an interest for the general reader, which will abundantly reward the attention he may bestow upon their perusal.

But we must close our imperfect sketch of President Maxcy and his works, though the subject has suggested much that we have left unsaid. We have lingered with pleasure over this volume of his literary remains, not only on account of their intrinsic merits, but equally perhaps, on account of the associations they possess with the condition of learning and religion in a former age, and with the men of honored name, who have passed away for ever, without leaving even such few memorials, as the hand of respectful regard has gathered for the name and memory of Maxcy. None of them were as eloquent as he, few were as gifted, as learned or as accomplished. But they lived worthily in the midst of adverse fortunes, and went down to the grave with their life-work nobly done. They planted our early churches; they founded our older institutions of learning; and through evil report, and good report, they preached the simple truths of the gospel, and maintained the principles of religious freedom, and the inalienable rights of the soul. They were not all skilled in the learning of the schools; but they knew well the human heart. They had associated with the world, and they understood its opinions and ways. They had meditated thoroughly the work of the

Christian ministry, and they entered upon it with a high conception of its responsibility, and pursued it with a singleness of aim, and a devotion of energy, that imparted dignity to their own characters, and secured the profound respect of their fellow-men. Alas, that so few memorials of them should now remain—that their names should have been so nearly forgotten. Let it invite us back to the study of the past history of our denomination, and stimulate us to new efforts to gather up and preserve every thing that can illustrate the character of our founders and fathers, or the early spread of our long despised and persecuted principles.

---

ARTICLE III.

PLUTARCH.

PLUTARCH ON THE DELAY OF THE DEITY IN THE PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED. *With Notes, by H. B. HACKETT, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Newton Theological Institution.* pp. 172. 18mo. Andover: Morrill & Wardwell. New York: Mark H. Newman. 1844.

THIS work has already been welcomed in various quarters, with a gratifying unanimity. But it suggests more than has yet been expressed; and the remarks with which it was introduced to the attention of our readers were so limited, that we need make no apology for adverting to the subject again. After a well-written Preface, the first forty or fifty pages are occupied by the Greek text, printed with a fair type, and with unusual neatness and accuracy. Then follows an extended analysis or outline of the discussion, in which the editor presents the main points briefly, but in a manner more lucid and impressive, if possible, than the author himself. Whoever reads this, and all can read it, whether they can read Greek or not, will pronounce it worth, beyond all estimate, more than the price of the whole book. It is worthy of being compared with a similar and most happy effort of Stillingfleet.\* After this, we have nearly a hundred pages of

---

In his *Origines Sacrae*, B. III, c. III, § 21.

Notes illustrating the text; a short appendix in reply to the question, "Had Plutarch any knowledge of Christianity?" an index of the Greek words and phrases which are illustrated in the notes with reference to some peculiarity of meaning, form, or construction; and an index of passages which are cited, in the notes, from the Old Testament and the New.

Among all the Moral Writings of Plutarch, none could have been selected more important in itself than the one before us, and none better adapted to awaken a general interest. Several of these writings have been lost. Those which remain may be reckoned as amounting to eighty-four. Some few of these, it is probable, are not genuine. In the edition of Wyttenbach, the eighty-four, exhibiting a great variety in form, extent and value, are as follows: 1. On the Education of Children. 2. How it becomes a young man to hear or read Poems. 3. On hearing the Philosophers. 4. How any one may distinguish a Flatterer from a Friend. 5. How any one may perceive himself advancing in Virtue. 6. How any one may be benefited by Enemies. 7. On having a Multitude of Friends. 8. On Chance. 9. On Virtue and Vice. 10. A Consolatory Epistle to Apollonius. 11. Precepts for the Preservation of Health. 12. Matrimonial Precepts. 13. The Banquet of the Seven Wise Men. 14. On Superstition. 15. Apothegms of Kings and Great Military Commanders. 16. Laconic Apothegms, or Remarkable Sayings of the Lacedemonians or Spartans. 17. Ancient Institutes of the Spartans. 18. Apothegms of Spartan Females. 19. Virtues of Women, or the Duties of a Wife towards her Husband. 20. Notes in reference to Roman Usages. 21. Notes in reference to Greek Usages. 22. On Greek and Roman Parallels, or a comparison of Events occurring among the Greeks, with similar Events occurring among the Romans. 23. On the Fortune of the Romans. 24. On the Fortune or Virtue of Alexander; two discourses or books. 25. Whether the Athenians are more renowned in War or in Wisdom. 26. On Isis and Osiris. 27. On the Letters (*Εἰ*) which were engraven over the Gate of Apollo's Temple at Delphi. 28. Why the Priestess of Pythian Apollo does not now give Responses in Verse. 29. On the Cessation of Oracles. 30. That Virtue is a thing to be Taught. 31. On Moral Virtue. 32. On Freedom from Anger. 33. On Cheerfulness. 34. On Fraternal Love. 35. On tender Affection towards one's Offspring. 36. Whether



Vice is sufficient to make the vicious Unhappy. 37. Whether the Passions of the Soul or the Sufferings of the Body are the Worse. 38. On Loquacity. 39. On Impertinent Intermeddling. 40. On Love of Riches. 41. On Bashfulness. 42. On Envy and Hatred. 43. On Praising one's self without exciting Envy. 44. On those who are tardily punished by the Deity; or, as Professor Hackett has well expressed the sense, On the Delay of the Deity in the Punishment of the Wicked. 45. On Fate. 46. On the Demon of Socrates. 47. On Exile. 48. A Consolatory Epistle to his own Wife. 49. Symposiacs, or nine books of Problems discussed at Table. 50. On Love. 51. Five Tragical Accounts respecting Lovers. 52. That a Philosopher ought to converse especially with Rulers. 53. To an Uninstructed Ruler. 54. Whether an Aged Man ought to be occupied with State Affairs. 55. Political Precepts. 56. On Monarchy, and Democracy, and Oligarchy. 57. Against Borrowing Money. 58. Lives of the Ten Orators. 59. Abstract of a Comparison of Aristophanes with Menander. 60. On the Malignity of Herodotus. 61. On the Opinions concerning Nature that please the Philosophers, in five books. 62. Natural Causes. 63. On the Face which appears within the Orb of the Moon. 64. On the first Principle of Cold. 65. On the Question, Whether Water or Fire is the more Useful. 66. Whether Land or Water Animals are the more Intelligent. 67. On Irrational Beings, using Reason. 68. On Eating Flesh; two discourses or books. 69. Platonic Inquiries. 70. On the Procreation of the Soul, as discussed in Plato's book entitled Timaeus. 71. Compendium of the Discourse on the Procreation of the Soul. 72. On the Contradictions of the Stoics. 73. Sketch of a Discourse showing that the Stoics assert things more Incredible than the Poets. 74. On Common Conceptions against the Stoics. 75. That it is not possible to live pleasantly according to Epicurus. 76. Against Colotes, an Epicurean. 77. Whether it was well said, Live Concealed. 78. On Music. 79. Fragments of Lost Books. 80. On Nobility. 81. On the names of Rivers and Mountains, and the things which are found in them. 82. On the Life and Poetry of Homer. 83. Proverbs which the Alexandrians used. 84. On Measures.\*

\* See *Πλουτάρχου τῶν Χαιρωνέως ΤΑ ΗΘΙΚΑ*. Plutarchi Chaeronensis *MORALIA*, id est Opera, exceptis Vitis, Reliqua, V Tom., cum Animadversionibus, II Tom., et Indice, I Tom., 8vo. Oxonii, 1795—1830; and compare a more

In the work before us, considering the difficulties of the subject and the circumstances of the author, he has conducted the discussion with admirable sobriety and skill. He has rebuked, beyond all caviling, the levity and rashness of the Epicureans; and presented some of the most convincing reasons to justify the ways of God to man. The story of Thespesius, introduced towards the close, may have suggested to Dante some of the imagery in his *Inferno*. On a few points, it is not strange if the statements of Plutarch are open to animadversion. We allude, principally, to such representations as we find in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, pp. 35—38, respecting the identity of a city in successive ages, and the identity of children with their parents. Here is need of discrimination, in order to meet the consciousness of the human mind, the announcements of divine revelation, and the dictates of right reason. The identity can be predicated only in part, and in relation to certain things.

The notes of the editor are clear and pertinent, the condensed results of extensive investigations. In his preface he remarks that "the main object of them has been, not so much to criticise the meaning and views of the writer, as to put the reader in a situation to form his own judgment on these and similar points. It was impossible, in order to attain this end, to insert fewer historical notes than have been introduced. The rule here followed was to presume, on the part of the reader, all the knowledge of this sort which it was reasonable to expect, and yet avoid making it necessary for him to resort to books which he might not have within his reach, or which he could not stop to examine without an irksome delay. Yet with this restriction, the space allotted to such notes is not inconsiderable; in part because the illustrations from fact and example, which occur in the work, are so very numerous, and in part because these take us so often entirely out of the ordinary circle of history." Respecting some of the references which he has made, he adds; "The design, in a part of them, has been to draw attention occasionally to those contrasts or accordances of sentiment which strike one in comparing the sacred Scriptures with the

---

recent edition, Greek and Latin, by Didot, 2 vols., 4to, Paris, 1841, which ought to be accompanied by Wyttenbach's *Animadversiones in Moralia*, published separately. A good edition, embracing not only the Moral Writings, but also the Lives of Plutarch, in the original, with a Latin version and annotations, was given to the public, by Reiske, in 12 volumes, 8vo, at Leipsic, 1774—1782.

writings of heathen authors, and which are not, surely, un-instructive, as showing the infinite superiority of the gospel to the purest pagan morality, while at the same time they teach us how entirely consonant to the dictates of sound reason are many of the very doctrines of revelation which objectors have most violently assailed. The other references of this nature relate mostly to points of language, which involve some analogy, more or less remote, to the New Testament, and which it seemed so much the more proper to remark, because the Greek of Plutarch belongs to the dialect in which the New Testament is written, with the exception of the Hebraistic element."

Plutarch, it will be recollected, was born about the middle of the first century, that is, about ten or fifteen years after the crucifixion of our Saviour. His birth-place, Chaeronea (now Capourna), was a small town in Bœotia, sixty or seventy miles northwest of Athens. It was in the vicinity of Delphi, the ancient seat of the far-famed Grecian oracle, and of the splendid worship of Apollo. He seems not only to have been early instructed in what was usually taught in the best schools of his time, but also to have toiled with uncommon assiduity, to perfect himself in every branch of literature and philosophy. Long before and in the reign of Trajan, he resided at Rome, and publicly taught philosophy there. He was highly esteemed in the most intelligent and respectable circles of the great metropolis. But, in the evening of life, he retired, with his family, to the scenes of his earliest years. There, it is probable, he revised some of his Moral Writings, and composed his celebrated Lives. At the same time, he performed, kindly and faithfully, the duties of a magistrate in his native city, and presided over the heathen worship, as a priest of Apollo. We are attracted by the excellent traits which appear in his character, and by the benevolent and elevating spirit which, generally, breathes in his productions. Would that an apostle could have visited him in his youth, and commended to him the gospel of Christ. What a new and heavenly light might have shone around him, in respect to the great problem which he mentions on the twenty-ninth page:—"It is likely that the soul of every sinner revolves these things within herself, and reasons, How, escaping from the memory of her iniquities, and delivering herself from the consciousness of them, and being made pure, she may, anew, live another life."



We do not wonder that a bishop of the Greek church,\* in the middle of the eleventh century, was prompted to pour forth the following prayer:—

*Ἐπερ τινὰς βούλοιο τῶν ἀλλοιγῶν  
 Τῆς σῆς ἀπειλῆς ἐξελεῖσθαι, Χριστέ μου,  
 Πλάτωνα καὶ Πλούταρχον ἐξέλοιο μοι.  
 Ἄμφω γάρ ἐσι καὶ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν τρόπον  
 Τοῖς σοῖς νόμοις ἔγγιστα προσπεφυκότες·  
 Εἰ δ' ἠγνόησαν ὡς Θεὸς σὺ τῶν ὅλων,  
 Ἐνταυθα τῆς σῆς χρησιμότητος δεῖ μόνον  
 Δι' ἣν ἀπαντας δωρεὰν σώζειν θέλεις.*

‘If indeed, O my Christ, thou mayest be willing to deliver from thy threatening any of the heathen, deliver for me Plato and Plutarch; for in word and in conduct they both are the nearest conformed to thy laws. But if they knew not that thou art God of the universe, here is need only of thy goodness, on account of which thou art willing to save all gratuitously.’

The beneficial, practical tendency of Plutarch’s instructions is one of their most interesting characteristics. In his work, if it be his, on the education of children, he says: ‘The only remedy for the infirmities and diseases of the soul, is philosophy. For by this, and with this, we may know what is beautiful, and what is base; what is just, and what is unjust; what on the whole is to be chosen, and what is to be avoided; how we are to treat the gods, parents, seniors, laws, strangers, rulers, friends, wives, children, servants; that we must revere the gods, honor parents, show respect to seniors, observe the laws, obey rulers, love friends, live discreetly with our wives, be affectionate towards our children, and not maltreat our servants; but, what is of the greatest importance, neither exult too much in prosperity, nor be too sad in adversity; nor be dissolute in our pleasures, nor exasperated and ferocious in our disgusts. These I regard as the principal advantages to be derived from philosophy. For to use success nobly, is the part of a man; and to use it without exciting envy, is the part of a man of moderation; to control pleasure by reason, is the part of the wise; and to overcome anger, is the part of an extraordinary man. But those

---

\* John Mauropus, metropolitan of Euchaita in Paphlagonia.

who are able to combine civil office with philosophy, I esteem perfect men.\* The following passage in his discourse on progress in virtue, is quite characteristic: 'When thou readest the writings or hearest the discourses of philosophers, see that thou attend not merely to the words, more than to the things; nor eagerly seek what is difficult and ornamental, more than what is apposite, and vigorous, and useful. So, too, when perusing poems and history, take heed that nothing escape thee that is suitably said for the improvement of moral conduct, or the moderation of passion. For as Simonides describes the bee among the flowers, while others admire only their color and their fragrance, and get nothing else; so while others are occupied in reading poems for the sake of pleasure and amusement,—thyself, finding and gathering something worthy of diligence, it is likely hast already become capable of discerning by the habitual use and the love of the morally beautiful and proper.† In the work mentioned at the head of this article, he refers to the teaching of Plato, that God is the pattern of all that is proportionate and fair; that human virtue is a kind of imitation of him; and that he bestows it upon those who have the energy to follow him; and then adds, 'There is no greater benefit which a man is constituted to enjoy from God, than to become virtuous by the imitation and pursuit of those things in him which are beautiful and good.‡

Plutarch treats, also, concerning the gods and divine things, and concerning various branches of natural philosophy. For the most part, he follows Plato, but sometimes Aristotle; and he loves to recur to Pythagoras and others anterior to Plato, 'the old theologians being the most ancient of philosophers.'|| Thus he reached a point, from which, in the spirit of the eclecticism which is better known in the form which it assumed at Alexandria, in the third century, under Ammonius Saccas and Plotinus, he supposed that he could reconcile various clashing systems of philosophy; and by profound, mystical explanations, purify and elevate, without really changing, the heathen religion and observances, by law established. The argument against all innovation or change, is stated in few words: 'The hereditary and ancient faith is

\* De Lib. Educ., 10. † De Prof. in Virt., 8. ‡ See c. 5, p. 16. || De An. Procr., 33.  
VOL. IX.—NO. XXXVI. 47\*

sufficient,—than which it is not possible to mention nor find out a proof more evident,

Though what is wise be found by mind acute ;

but this, lying as a common foundation and basis to piety, becomes insecure and suspected by all, if its stability and legal establishment, at any one point, be distorted and shaken.\*

The treatise on Isis and Osiris, in which Plutarch discourses concerning the ancient religion and philosophy of the Egyptians and of other nations, exemplifies, remarkably, the tendency of his mind, and the earnestness and ingenuity with which some of the better portion of the defenders of the established heathenism maintained their cause. 'We denominate them gods,' he remarks, 'not some in one place and others in another, nor some barbarian and others Grecian, not some southern and some northern, but as the sun, and the moon, and the heaven, and the earth, and the sea, are common to all, but are named differently by different nations, so, while one Reason adorns these, and one Providence governs, and subordinate powers are placed over all, there are in different countries, according to the laws, different honors and appellations. And the consecrated men use symbols, some indeed such as are obscure, but others, such as are more clear, leading our thoughts to things divine, not without danger. For some, led astray altogether, have slid into superstition ; but others, escaping superstition as a swamp, have inadvertently, on the other hand, fallen into atheism, as down a precipice. Therefore, in respect to these matters, we ought especially, having from philosophy received reason as initiating us into the sacred mysteries, to conceive religiously of each of those things which are said and done, lest, not understanding aright what the laws have well instituted respecting sacrifices and festivals, we should do wrong.†

In another passage of the same treatise, we hear him advocating the Zoroastrian doctrine of two original antagonist powers, and see clearly some of the elements out of which at length were constructed those Gnostic and Manichean systems, which have left so deep an impression on the early history of opinions in the Christian church. 'Neither in

\* Amat., 13.

† De Is. et Os., 67.



bodies without life,' he says, 'are we to place the beginnings of the universe, as Democritus and Epicurus have done; nor are we, like the Stoics, to suppose an artificer of inert matter, one Reason and one Providence governing and holding all things. For it would be impossible that there should be any thing bad, were God the author of all, and that there should be any thing good, were he the author of nothing. According to Heraclitus, the harmony of the world, like a lyre or a bow, is in a state of tension; and according to Euripides, there cannot be, separately, good things and bad; but there is a kind of commingling, so as to be well arranged.

Nor good nor bad can be single;  
But, to useful ends, they mingle.

And therefore, this most ancient opinion has come down from theologians and legislators to poets and philosophers, having an origin so remote that its author is unknown, and obtaining a credence strong and indelible, propagated extensively, not in words only, nor in reports, but in rites of initiation and in sacrifices, both among barbarians and among Greeks; namely, that the universe is not suspended upon chance, without intelligence, and reason, and a governor; nor is the reason that holds and directs it as by rudders and bits obedient to the reins, one; but as nature yields many things and mingled with bad and with good, or rather (to speak briefly) nothing unmingled here,—one steward does not mingle for us our affairs as the liquors of two casks, dealing them out like a bar-keeper, but life and the world, if not the whole, yet this portion that is terrestrial and sublunary, being mixed from two contrary beginnings and two antagonist powers, the one leading to the right hand and directly, but the other perverting and thrusting back, is become unequal and varied, and subject to all changes. For if nothing exists without a cause, and what is good does not furnish the cause of evil, then there must be in nature a distinct generation and beginning of evil also, as there is of good. And this is the opinion of most men and the wisest. For some think that there are two gods, as rival workmen, the one an artificer of good things, and the other of bad. Some call the better one, God; and the other, Demon, as did Zoroaster the magian. He called the one Oromazes, and the other, Ahriman; and maintained, besides, that the one resembles light more than

any thing else perceptible; the other, again, darkness and ignorance; and that, intermediate between the two, is Mithras.\*

In accordance with this view, he interprets some expressions in the writings of Plato, which that renowned philosopher had left in great obscurity. 'Plato in many places, as it were shading and veiling his opinions, names the one of the contrary principles *the same*, and the other, *the diverse*. But in his book on the Laws, when he was old, he says, not by enigmas nor symbolically, but in decisive words, that the world is moved, not by one soul, but by several perhaps; and certainly not by fewer than two; hence that the one is beneficent, but the other, contrary to this, and the artificer of things contrary. Moreover, he leaves also, between those two, a certain third nature, not without soul, nor without reason, nor without motion of itself, as some think; but exposed to both those principles, yet aiming at the better, and desiring and pursuing it; as the subsequent parts of this discourse will show, which is intended to reconcile the theology of the Egyptians with this philosophy. For the origin and frame of this world are mingled or made up of contrary powers, though not such as are of equal strength, but the predominance is that of the better. Yet it is altogether impossible that the bad be destroyed, much of it being inherent in the body and much of it in the soul of the universe, and always contending fiercely with the better part. In this soul, therefore, intellect and reason, the governor of all the best things, is Osiris; and in the earth, and the winds, and the water, and the heaven, and the stars, what is arranged and constituted, and healthy, in seasons, and temperaments of air, and periodical revolutions, is an efflux and manifested image of Osiris. But the passionate, and Titanic, and irrational, and rash part of this soul, is Typhon; and the faulty part of the bodily frame of the world, and that which causes disease, and that which produces alarm by untimely seasons, and inclement weather, and eclipses of the sun, and disappearings of the moon, is, as it were, the devastating excursions of Typhon.†

In accordance, too, with the same view, Plutarch maintains the eternity of matter, and proceeds thus in his work on the Procreation of the Soul: 'It is better, therefore, that

---

\* De Is. et Os., 45, 46.

† De Is. et Os., 48, 49.

we believe Plato, and say and sing that the world was made by God; for it is the most beautiful of the things which have been made, and he is the best of causes; but that the substance and matter out of which it was framed, not being made, but lying always before the artificer, presented itself for its arrangement and order, and likeness to him, as far as possible. For the production was not out of what did not exist, but out of what was wanting in beauty and fitness. . . . The perplexities of the Stoics overtake us, if we introduce evil from non-entity without cause and without generation; since among existences, it is probable that neither that which is good nor that which is inert has produced the being and generation of evil. But Plato avoided the error into which they fell who came after him. Nor did he, like them, overlooking the third principle and power which is between matter and God, adventure that most absurd of statements which makes the production of evils something brought in spontaneously by chance. . . . And placing the cause of evils as far as possible from God, he has in his Political discourse written thus concerning the world: For from its framer it acquired all things beautiful; but whatever things, from former habit, are noxious and unjust in heaven, these the world itself also has from that habit, and produces them in the living creatures.\*. . . Thus it is shown to us by many proofs that the soul is not all the work of God; but that, having the portion of evil inherent in itself, it was adorned by him; while he has limited infinitude to the individual, that substance might become partaker of limit; and, by the power of *the same* and by that of *the diverse*, has commingled order and change, and difference and simplicity, and moreover, has produced communion and friendship with one another, as much as possible, by numbers and harmony.†

Closely connected with these representations, we have, in another work of Plutarch, the following statement respecting the human soul: 'But it seems to have escaped the observation of them all, that each of us is truly twofold and compounded; for they perceived not the other duality, but only the mixture of the soul and body, this being the more manifest. But that of the soul itself there is in itself a certain compound, twofold and dissimilar, as of another irrational body that is commingled and conjoined with reason

---

\* De An. Procr., 5, 6, 7.

† De An. Procr., 28.



by a certain necessity and nature, Pythagoras seems not to have been ignorant. . . . Plato clearly, and strongly, and decidedly perceived that the soul of the universe is not single, nor uncompounded, nor uniform, but being mingled or made up from the power of *the same* and from that of *the diverse*, it is, in some places, always well regulated, and moves round in the same manner, observing one undisturbed order; but in other places, it is divided into movements and circles that are contrary and wandering,—the beginning and generation of difference. The soul, too, of man, being a part and section of that of the universe, and conjoined upon similar proportions and numbers, is not simple nor affected alike in its different parts, but has one part that is intelligent and rational, by which it is suitable to control and govern the man conformably to the laws of nature; but the other passionate, and unreasonable, and prone to wander, and disorderly of itself, needing restraint. And this again is divided into two parts. The one, always corporeal, is called concupiscent; and the other, sometimes joining itself to this, and sometimes giving force and energy against this to reason, is called vehement. And the difference is made manifest especially by the combat of reason and sobriety with concupiscence and vehemence, and it is shown that different things are often disobeying and fiercely contending against that which is the best.\*

Here we hardly need to remark, what, in harmony with the Holy Scriptures, has, since the days of Plutarch, been more generally admitted among philosophers than it was before, namely, that the origin of evil is to be found, not in the eternal perversity of matter, but in the abuse of the freedom with which the soul of a moral agent is endowed. Still, though it would be painful, yet it would be interesting and instructive, at a suitable time, to trace the influence of that ancient and wide-spread error in predisposing the minds of men to various distorted views and corruptions of Christian doctrine.

We hasten, now, to present to our readers some of Plutarch's views respecting demons, the good and the evil. 'Let us,' he says, 'neither listen to those who say that certain predictions are not divinely inspired, or that initiations and sacrifices with solemn rites and ceremonies are not cared

---

\* De Virt. Mor., 3.

for by the gods; nor, on the other hand, let us think that the God occupies himself in them, and is present, and is engaged with us; but ascribing these things to those ministers of the gods to whom it is suitable, as to servants and scribes, let us believe that there are demons, inspectors of the sacred rites of the gods and attendants on the mysteries; but that others move about, as avengers of proud and enormous acts of injustice; but some Hesiod very reverently addressed, as being honorable givers of wealth, and possessing this regal dignity, since the bestowing of favors is a prerogative befitting a king.\*. . . Concerning the mystic rites in which we may receive the greatest evidences and manifestations of the truth in respect to demons, let me, as Herodotus says, observe a reverential silence. But the festivals and sacrifices, as unlucky and mournful days, in which there are the eating of raw flesh, and the tearing of it to pieces, fastings, and beating of the breast, and, in many places, obscene words amidst the sacred rites, and ravings and shoutings excited by the haughty, tumultuous uproar, I would affirm to be consecrated to none of the gods as things propitiatory and appeasing, but for the sake of turning away evil demons. And, it is probable, neither the gods require and accept the human sacrifices anciently made; nor did kings and generals admit them without cause, giving up their own children, and sacrificing and slaying them, but averting and satiating the anger and discontent of rough and morose avengers, or the violent and tyrannical lusts of some not able or not willing to converse with bodies and by bodies. . . . And what in fables and hymns is said and sung in respect now to acts of carrying off by violence, and now to wanderings of the gods, their being concealed and banished, and their being put to service for hire, must be attributed, not to gods, but to demons.†. . . They do better who maintain that the things related concerning Typhon, and Osiris, and Isis, were events neither of gods nor of men, but of grand demons, whom Plato, and Pythagoras, and Xenocrates, and Chrysippus, following the ancient theologians, affirm to be stronger than men, and excelling our nature by their great powers, yet not having divinity pure and unmixed, but participating in the nature of the soul and in that sensitiveness of the body which receives pleasure and pain; and whatever is involved in these changes disturbs

---

\* De Defect. Orac., 13.

† De. Defect. Orac., 14, 15.

some of them more and others less. For there are among demons, as among men, different degrees of virtue and of vice. . . . Plato assigns to the Olympic gods prosperous things and odd numbers, but the opposites of these to demons. And Xenocrates is of opinion that the unlucky days, and those seasons of public observance which have certain scourgings, or beatings of the breast, or fastings, or injurious speeches, or obscene language, are befitting the honors neither of gods nor of good demons; but that, in the circumambient air, there are great and mighty natures, yet morose and gloomy, who rejoice in such things, and having obtained them, betake themselves to nothing worse. But on the other hand, Hesiod denominates the kind and good, 'holy demons and guardians of men.' And Plato calls this species *interpreting* and *ministering*, intermediate between gods and men, sending up thither our prayers, and bringing hither predictions and gifts of good things. Besides, Empedocles asserts that the demons undergo penalties for whatever sins and transgressions they may commit, until having been punished thus and purified, they receive again the region and rank that accord with their nature. Things like these, it is reported, are said concerning Typhon, how he, through envy and malevolence, perpetrated terrible deeds, and, throwing all into confusion, filled at the same time, land and sea with evils; then at length he was punished.\*. . . Plutarch proceeds to speak of Isis and Osiris as being for their virtue changed from good demons into gods, 'as were Hercules and Bacchus afterwards. . . . But the power of Typhon being obscured and broken, and ready to expire, and in the agonies of death, he is sometimes soothed and assuaged with certain sacrifices; and sometimes again he is severely humbled and treated with contumely on certain days of public observance. The Pythagoreans, it is evident, consider Typhon a demonic power.† And, near the beginning of his *Life of Dion*, Plutarch says, 'I know not but that we may be compelled to admit the extraordinary account of the ancients, that evil and malignant demons, envying good men and withstanding their course, bring upon them disturbances and fears, shaking their virtue and causing it to fall, lest, continuing steadfast and pure in what is right, they should after death obtain a better portion than themselves.'

---

\* De Is. et Os., 25, 26, 27.

† De Is. et Os., 27, 30.



We have no time to comment on the views here presented respecting demons. We leave our readers to make their own reflections. But who will not exclaim, with the apostle Paul, The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God?\*

In the sketch which we have now given, and which we have drawn directly from the original, our readers have been listening to the most distinguished heathen philosopher of the age immediately succeeding that in which Christianity, like a little leaven, was introduced into the mass of human society. We have wished to let them hear *him* speak on some topics the discussion of which by him is adapted to transport us to the remote period in which he lived and taught, and to give us some conception of the interesting position which he occupied, and of the state of the public mind at that eventful period. He may be regarded as the best representative of the best and most prevalent Greek philosophy of his day. Rich in the stores of erudition, familiar with the history of the ages that had passed, so far as it had been delivered by his own countrymen, a keen observer of men and of their affairs, and glowing with an enlarged benevolence, he has imparted many a lesson of wisdom. His ardent love of his native country inclined him, perhaps, to admire excessively all that was Grecian. His reverence for antiquity led him, in the circumstances in which he was placed, to cherish the fond, vain hope of infusing life and purity into the forms of the ancient heathen worship. With this were connected in his mind, the deepest and best affections of the soul feeling after God. Around this, to guard and defend it, were clustered the enchanting influences of classical associations, and of much that was tasteful, and dignified, and glorious. It was the religion of the state. To impugn it seemed profane, sacrilegious, treasonable. In his estimation, the ancient poets and the wisest of the philosophers could for the most part, be so explained as to utter in its support a harmonious voice. No substitute for it had been mentioned in his hearing. Amidst the perplexities, the shadows, and the dim reflected lights of heathenism, and under the influence, more or less, of his early impressions and of his peculiar position, behold him, in the exercise of reason and conscience, pondering on

---

\* 1 Cor. 10: 20.

life, death, and immortality. . . . There he stands, in flowing robes, the priest of Apollo,—the official defender of the ancient idolatrous faith, the sincere and venerable conservator of a corrupt, enormous system that was soon to pass away. He seems cordially devoted to the sacerdotal service, and expecting to remain in it till the very close of life. We hear him, in persuading an aged friend to continue attention to public business, saying: ‘Thou knowest that I have ministered to Pythian Apollo during many a celebration of his festivals; but thou wouldst not say to me, O Plutarch, thou hast sufficiently sacrificed, and walked in procession, and led the solemn dance; it is now time, that, being in years, thou shouldst lay aside the garland, and leave the oracle, on account of old age.’\*

That garland which graced the brow and the thin white locks of Plutarch in his extreme old age, has long since been laid aside. The solemn festive dance, with its resounding music, is seen and heard no more. The long procession has ceased to move on towards the temple at Delphi. That magnificent temple, the god himself, the thronging worshippers, and the whole system to which they were devoted, have long since passed away. But most of the writings of this extraordinary man remain. These and the other classic productions of heathen antiquity, like so many citadels and spacious edifices furnished with rare and varied treasures, have, since the great struggle with heathenism in the Roman empire, fallen into our hands. The fault will be our own, if we do not, as faithful Christians, take and keep possession of them, and examine carefully their contents, and use them with wise discrimination. Let us, then, in the best and highest sense of the phrase, erect the cross upon them. Let us know, and admit frankly, and employ, with heavenly skill, all that is right and valuable in those productions; and, wherever they are adverse to the Christian standard, let us be prepared to show clearly their faults and inferiority. An apostle has said, “Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.” And when he was at Athens, he did not hesitate to quote, with approbation, a passage from a heathen poet.

We had intended to expatiate somewhat more largely on the *Moral*, or, as we might denominate them, the *Miscella-*

---

\* An Seni sit gerenda Resp., 17.

*neous* Writings of Plutarch, as distinct works, and as a whole ; but, at present, we must content ourselves with merely suggesting the desirableness of a new English translation, suitable to accompany an improved edition of his *Lives* by the Langhorne. Under an able and judicious editor, it might well combine the labors of several of the ripest scholars in almost every department of knowledge ; and, if prepared in a worthy and truly Christian style, it would be invaluable.

---

ARTICLE IV.

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 14: 6—11.

BY THE EDITOR.

“ 6. Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life ; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

“ 7. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also ; and from henceforth ye know him and have seen him.

“ 8. Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.

“ 9. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip ? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father : and how sayest thou *then*, Shew us the Father ?

“ 10. Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me ? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself ; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.

“ 11. Believe me, that I am in the Father and the Father in me ; or else believe me for the very works’ sake.”

THE evangelist John dwelt upon peculiar views of our Saviour’s character. He probably knew Christ more intimately than any of the apostles. He was admitted to a clearer insight than they into that which was veiled from the public eye, and which the public mind did not comprehend. It was the design of his gospel to communicate some of these higher views. Hence, he selects the narratives and conversations which appear in his gospel, not so much because they had been omitted by preceding writers, as because they suited this, his peculiar aim.\* The Lord Jesus, during the whole

---

\* See an article in this Review, entitled “ Object of the Writers of the Gospel History,” Vol. VII, p. 273.



period of his ministry, often spoke in such a manner as to reveal his true dignity. His works, too, bore witness to him. But in the later communications which he held with his disciples, he disclosed himself more and more clearly. The great mystery of his constitution was developed in a ratio somewhat proportioned to the nearness of the period of his glorification. As that event approached, he could most appropriately put off the garb of concealment, and clothe himself in his panoply of light. He chose to reveal himself only by degrees. He chose, also, to select the individuals in whose presence the divinity that dwelt in him should announce itself; perhaps, because some even of the disciples were not ripe for such disclosures; perhaps, because the world could not comprehend or receive the truth; perhaps, because he would prepare the public mind beforehand for the mysterious light that was to burst upon it, lest the intense radiance, poured at once upon a weak vision, should destroy the power of sight, instead of aiding and gratifying it.

The passage quoted at the head of this article is supposed to have belonged to some of the latest communications of our Lord to his disciples during the period of his incarnation. If the fourteenth chapter contains the substance of what our Saviour said at the table where the sacramental supper was instituted, as most harmonists agree, we see an obvious fitness in the communication to the time, place, and circumstances. That wonderful personage had gone about in the cities and villages of Palestine for three years, instructing the ignorant, healing the sick, raising the dead, giving sight to the blind and hearing to the deaf, and preaching the gospel to the poor. In the course of his ministry, signs and wonders clustered with astounding profusion along his path. The witnesses of his gracious words and of his mighty works were scattered from one end of the country to the other. His deeds were not done in a corner. The land, the sea, night and day, man, woman and child, the living and the dead, bore testimony concerning him, that he was not a man like other men. Never man spake or did like this man. He had now come to the end of his eventful career. The aim of his incarnation was about to be attained. He drew near the consummation for which he so ardently longed. The very next scene was to be the opening scene of it. How appropriate an occasion was this, after he had administered such

consolations as even men of stout hearts and iron nerves might be expected to need in the approaching crisis, to reveal, at last, in words, that which he had so fully shown by his works, that his body was the temple of divinity; that the words he spake and the miracles he wrought, though such a gloomy termination was about to follow them, were the testimonies to his divine character. It was fitting that, before he suffered, he should make a distinct announcement of his character and claims, which his disciples, hitherto slow of faith, might understand and believe. They were to be his witnesses; and such a declaration was suitable, as an additional preparation for their sacred office. In this conversation of Thomas, Philip and Christ, the way was opened for Christ to manifest himself. Let us contemplate the manner of that manifestation, and the distinctness with which it was made.

The touching scene of the distribution, symbolically, of the flesh and blood of their Master, had placed the disciples, as it were, in the midst of the scene of his sufferings, and filled them with grief. Hence our Lord addressed them in v. 1, "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God; believe also in me." He assured them, also, that notwithstanding the separation he had just predicted (13: 33, 36), he was to be absent only a little while, and then he would come and receive them to himself, to the mansions prepared for them, vs. 2, 3. So often had he spoken of his departure, and so vividly had the nature of it been set forth in the ordinance just instituted, that Christ seems to have supposed that the disciples would have fully understood him, at least on this point, v. 4. But their minds were still held by the lingering idea of a temporal kingdom, which their Master was to set up. They could not believe that the sweet and solemn season which they then enjoyed together was to be their last; and that Christ was to go out from it to be betrayed and arrested, tried and condemned, and finally crucified as a malefactor. His allusions to such an event, as he drew near the close of his earthly career, though they grew continually more frequent and more distinct, seemed to them but dreams. Hence Thomas, speaking in behalf of the whole, said, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?"—v. 5. The response of Thomas includes two points, on which he sought to be enlightened. But

in his answer, Christ passes by the first, as a thing of inferior moment. It was less important for the disciples to know that Christ was going to the Father, than to know that which was practical, the way of access to the Father. To this latter point Christ suits his reply. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life." Christ is the way of access to the Father. Eph. 2: 18. 1 Pet. 3: 18. He is also called the door, in the same sense. John 10: 7, 9. God, as God, is denominated "the life," or "the eternal life," both with the article. Christ is the door, the way to that life, because by him, our Mediator, we have access to God. Compare 1 John 1: 2—"For the Life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us"—with 1 Tim. 3: 16—"God was manifest in the flesh." Compare also John 1: 1 with 1: 14. God, who is absolute Life, is contrasted with death; and the communication of his being, in regeneracy, giving the elements of a godlike life, is contrasted with the state of unconverted persons, who share no such communications, and whose state is, hence, a state of death. "He that hateth his brother abideth in death." Hence, also, God is the living God, because he is the fountain of life, in distinction from all other beings, whose life is dependent on him. So, likewise, it is said of God, "Who alone hath immortality;" because, being, absolute and eternal, is an attribute of his nature; but it is enjoyed by his creatures, only by virtue of their connection with him. In the same manner, he is called, "God who quickeneth all things." God is the Life, and Christ is the way to that Life. In this respect, Christ, the Mediator, is the way, and God is the end.

We reach the same view if we contemplate God as the Truth. God is the absolute Truth; he is the Truth, as opposed to Falsehood. Satan is the father of lies, John 8: 44; God is the father and fountain of truth. Olshausen remarks that, in the dialect of John, a distinction is to be made between the forms *ἀλήθεια* and *ἡ ἀλήθεια*—the word with or without the article. The Truth, as he uses it, is the same with Being. It is opposed, not only to falsehood, but to vanity (emptiness of being, *ματαιότης*), Rom. 8: 20. This is the characteristic of the sinful world; but God and his Word are Truth (*ἀλήθεια*). The absolute Truth is God himself. The terms "Truth"



and "God" seem to be used as parallelisms in John 18: 37 compared with 8: 47. "He that is of the *Truth* heareth my voice." "He that is of *God* heareth God's words." Hence Christians, when they are sanctified by the Truth, John 17: 17, are said to be partakers of the divine nature, 2 Pet. 1: 4. 1 John 1: 3. This view of the usage of the term *Truth*, ἡ ἀλήθεια, gives peculiar force to many passages of the New Testament. The author already quoted says, "Christ calls himself the way (ἡ ὁδός), in order to withdraw the attention of the disciples from every other way, and to direct their thoughts to himself as the only Mediator, and guide to the Father. But he does not call himself the leader (ὁδηγός), because his life which he communicates to his disciples is that by which he opens the way to God. A person comes to God only by becoming godly. No change of place, no external influences, such as instruction or example, can lead the soul to him. It must be the secret, inward participation in the divine nature. But this participation is effected only through Christ, who, not by any exterior agency, but by himself leads us to God." God is the Truth and the Life. Christ is the way to him; and to him, he himself was now about to go. Christ is the way, God, the end. But in this passage, Christ asserts his own divine dignity, and announces himself also as the end, the ἀλήθεια and the ζωή. He includes himself in the Father. "I am in the Father, and the Father in me." The attributes and qualities of the Father were in him. "In him was life." John 1: 4. He was the self-existent fountain of life. "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Hence Christ says, "I am the resurrection and the life." He is also called "our life," Col. 3: 4, because the life or being of God is communicated to us through him. Thus it is that we see the connection of John 1: 4 with 1: 3,—"All things were made by him," because in him dwelt creative, life-giving power. As he is the Life, so he is a living spirit in his disciples. "Christ liveth in me," Gal. 2: 20. In him are the sources of life, the materials by which it is sustained. He is the bread of life, John 6: 35, 48, and the water of life, 4: 14. He is the vine, from whose root life is sent forth to all the branches, 15: 5. He is the body, containing the springs of life and motion, and his disciples are the members, the limbs of that living, life-dispensing structure, Eph. 5: 30. As Christ

is the Life, so also he is the Truth. In John 1: 14, we read that he was "full of grace and truth." In several texts in the New Testament, it is not improbable that he is alluded to, directly or indirectly, under the term ἀλήθεια. So that however much of fancy there may be in the celebrated Latin anagram of Pilate's question to Christ, it utters an interesting and veritable fact, exactly in point in this place—*Quid est veritas? Est vir qui adest.*

When Christ speaks in the context, of going to the Father, he obviously refers to his human nature. For, as to his divine nature, he was always "in the Father, and the Father in him." In this text, therefore, as well as in the verses that follow, our Lord sets forth before his disciples the dignity of his character. That which he ascribes to the Father, he claims also for himself. If the Father is the end, in respect to which he is the Mediator and way, he is likewise himself the end. His mediatorial office, fulfilled, is the preparation for the regal office, which awaits him. In discharging the duties of his official subordination, he is the way; but he is, also, the Truth and the Life. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me"—i. e., I am the medium of all access to the Father. Through me alone the life-giving Father is approached. The disciples were troubled by the anticipation of losing his presence. By this unfolding of his divinity, he encouraged them to dismiss their fears; for as often as they came to God, they would come to him. He was in the Father, and the Father in him. He had proved this, his near relation to the Father, both by his words and his works. He was the way; and not the way only, but the Truth and the Life. The forlorn disciples might, after his departure, not merely come by him to God, a Being whose power awed them, whose justice intimidated, whose threatenings repelled them; but they might come to himself, whose love they had tested, whose interest in them was most manifest, whose condescension had secured their gratitude, his sympathy, their love, and his miracles, their trust. To come to him was to come to God. "I am in the Father, and the Father in me. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth (ἀπ' ἄρτι=ἄρτι, now, even now) ye know him, and have seen him." How consoling was this to the brethren. It quelled the grief of anticipated separation, and seemed to set

them at once in the presence of God, as their reconciled friend, their portion, their hope, and their deliverer. In the midst of their desolation, they saw the universe clothed in charms again. They felt that, though bereft of the visible presence of their Master, they could still address him as confidently as ever. The storm yet raged and beat, and was destined to descend with still more terrific fury. But a bow of promise had stationed itself on the angry cloud. However severe the tempest might prove, their Master was at the helm. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me."

In vs. 7, 9, Christ administers to the weaker disciples a gentle rebuke, because they were still so ignorant of his true character. Even Peter, who had enjoyed higher opportunities than most of his brethren, seems, notwithstanding, to have deserved a small share of the same rebuke, (John 13: 36, 37). The developments of his character which Christ had made, both in words and works (vs. 10, 11), had not been fully comprehended. Some, at least, of the disciples saw in them the manifestations of a wonderful and mighty man, of a great prophet; but they did not recognize the indwelling of the Divinity. But Christ says, "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." He was desirous, before his departure, to give them correct views. They had not yet fully comprehended him, as the beginning of the verse implies. But the remarks which follow show that this ignorance was not a necessary ignorance. The means of dissipating it were within their reach—before their eyes; "and even now ye know him (the Father), and have seen him." The form *ἀπ' ἄρτι* is equivalent to *ἄρτι*, with an intensive signification—now, even now. So also, John 13: 19—"Now, *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, I tell you, etc." Also, Rev. 14: 13, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord *ἀπ' ἄρτι*, even now,"—not, "from henceforth." It cannot mean to refer to the time of the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, revealing the true character of Christ, since our Saviour reproaches Philip that he did not already know him. But he was not in fault, if the revelation of the Spirit was to show, for the first time, the true dignity of our Lord.

Without controversy, it was the divine Being, to whom reference is made in this text. It was the supreme and essential Godhead, whose indwelling Christ would have his disciples recognize in himself. It was that infinite, inde-



pendent, omnipotent, eternal King of kings and Lord of lords, of whom he affirms, "even now ye know him, and have seen him." The reference is too distinct to be mistaken; and the force of the reasoning of the text and context is sufficient to settle for ever the character and claims of our incarnate Lord. It is nothing to the purpose, in the way of objection, to say that the bodily form seen by the disciples was not the spiritual Father. It was not, indeed, with the bodily eyes that they beheld the enshrinement of Godhead. But when they looked upon the Redeemer's form, they looked upon that in which the Godhead dwelt. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

Philip seems not yet to have comprehended the meaning of Christ. Understanding his words in a literal, physical sense, he says in reply, with touching simplicity and childlikeness, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us," v. 8. Not recognizing the true character of the Redeemer, and burning with a desire like that of Moses, anciently—"I beseech thee, shew me thy glory,"—he expresses his deep conviction that nothing was so much to be wished as a view of God—a distinct perception of his presence, as it is not revealed to the world. He probably craved some brilliant, visible manifestation of the Deity, such as had been vouchsafed to the patriarchs and prophets. He did not know with whom he had been on terms of intimacy for the last three years. He had failed to enter into the comprehension of the mysterious personage, with whom he had walked and talked, who had travelled with him through the cities and villages of Palestine, and by whose mighty works he had been edified and astonished. He knew not what a teacher had instructed him. And now, at the very close of our Lord's ministry, his disciple, as if he had suddenly been set back again at the commencement of it,—before he had heard a mysterious word from his Master's lips, or seen a mighty work from his hands—as if he had overlooked every thing which our Lord sought to teach—says, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." It is not to be wondered at, that with a feeling of disappointment, surprise, and grief, the Redeemer replied, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and

how sayest thou, then, shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works. Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very works' sake," vs. 9—11.

In this sublime passage, Christ at length addresses the doubting disciple in terms whose meaning could not be misunderstood. He reveals himself in a manner that admitted no more hesitation. As plainly as human language would permit him to speak on so inexplicable a theme, he shows that his own person was a manifestation of the Father, in other words, of the Deity; that when the disciples looked upon him, they saw the divine nature, revealed. Moses saw, anciently, one manifestation of the Father; the disciples in the New Testament saw another; but however unlike they may have been, in form, or manner, or circumstances, it remains true that he who has seen one manifestation of God has seen God, as really as he who has seen another manifestation of him. It was not wise, then, for Thomas to wish for a repetition of such exhibitions as occurred in the early part of the ancient dispensation; because he was already enjoying that which was valid, convincing, and satisfactory.

It is observable how Christ repeats the main idea contained in these verses, and utters it in different forms, that he might secure the more distinct impression. Twice he affirms, "I am in the Father, and the Father in me,"—a statement, which plainly involves a mysterious, but not unintelligible, truth. Again, he appeals to the senses of his disciples,—“He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.” He appeals, also, to their intellectual perception and recognition of his own character, as involving the perception and recognition of a divine element enshrined within it—“If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.” He appeals to the present moment and to their immediate act as beings of intellect and sense,—“Even now ye know him, and have seen him.” In his words and works which they had witnessed with wonder and joy, he affirms that there was another voice than that which addressed itself from organs of sense to the outward ear, and a being of nobler rank and mightier energy, concealed in the form

which appeared to the outward eye. The words of Christ were not his words, the words of the visible man, clothed only with human dignity and authority, as it might seem; but, as the form of the text implies, the words of the Father. And, "The Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."

In these forms, our Lord evidently designed to indicate his oneness with the Father, and hence, his own essential and supreme divinity. It is not a moral union, but a union of being, of essence. If only a moral union were meant, then we might, equally, see the Father in every truly good man. "Rays of celestial light," as a distinguished commentator remarks, "we may see in worthy men; but the divinity itself, in living concentration, appeared only in Christ Jesus." The two forms, "I am in the Father," and "the Father in me," are not to be regarded as a repetition of the same, or a kindred thought, for the sake of intensity; but as implying a mutual relation between the Father and the Son; an influence, mutually exerted. The expression is used, in the poverty of mortal speech, to indicate the most intimate connection of the first and second persons of the Trinity. Rosenmüller remarks, "The phrase refers to the intimate conjunction of Christ with the Father, in will, plans, power and divine dignity." Tittmann says, "Since a conjunction, not only in respect of counsel and will, but in respect of one and the same energy and power, subsists between the Father and the Son, it may hence with certainty be inferred that there is also between them a communion of one and the same nature; and when our Lord affirms that the Father abideth in him, he has indicated a perpetuity of mutual conjunction, and testifies that it is impossible he should ever do any thing contrary to the mind, counsel and wishes of the Father." If we had only the clause, "the Father is in me," we could easily explain it as signifying that the Divinity was clothed in human form, being a resident of the body of Christ,—an explanation which would accord with obvious and acknowledged fact. But when the two forms of thought appear together, we are admonished that both must be interpreted in a manner consistently with the demands of each. Hence the idea of a physical indwelling must be exchanged for that of a union of substance, of nature, a oneness of being. Human language, when it is



used to describe infinite and incomprehensible facts, cannot but labor under the disadvantages arising from its imperfection. That which is finite cannot, in its weakness, attain to that which is boundless, divine, and eternal. And in no point is the inadequacy of the forms of human speech more obvious, than in attempts to discuss the mysteries of the divine nature. We are interested and edified in observing the efforts of the sacred writers, both in their own instructions and in their narratives of the conversations of our Lord, not to expound that which is inexplicable, but to utter that which is unutterable. On the topic treated of in the verses at the head of this paper, how many methods the sacred writers use; how they labor to express this inexpressible idea!—at one time by different prepositions, at another by the use of metaphors; now by a peculiar combination of common words, and now by a special application of the usual forms of speech; now by a single term, and now by a phrase; here by a plain, yet not the less difficult statement, and there by a paradox. In John 1: 1, 2, the preposition *πρὸς* is used, with the accusative. It is rendered *with* in our version; but not in the sense of association; not to express the relation of companionship, or contiguity; as appears from the latter part of verse 1. The Logos was in the beginning *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, with God; yet the relation implied in the preposition *πρὸς* is such as not to interfere with the truth stated in the next clause, the Logos was God—*Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*. In John 10: 38, the preposition *ἐν* is employed—"That ye may know and believe that the Father is *in* me,—yet the relation implied in the use of the preposition *ἐν*, *in*, must not be interpreted in such a way as to be inconsistent with that which immediately follows, *καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ*—"and I in him." In Heb. 1: 2, we are taught that God made the worlds *by Christ*,—*δι' οὗ*. Yet Christ was not the instrument of divine efficiency in any such sense as to detract from the doctrine of the same inspired volume, that "all things were created by him, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible, and invisible," Col. 1: 16, that "all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made," John 1: 3, and that, "by him all things consist," Col. 1: 17. Christ is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person." Yet he is not a mere copy, a pattern, a reflection of him

who dwelleth in light inapproachable and full of glory ; not an emanation of divinity, as light is an emanation from the sun, or caloric from a heated body ; but he is himself the sun, the light, the glory—"over all, God blessed for ever," Rom. 9: 5. The expressions in the passage under consideration—"I am in the Father, and the Father in me,"—"he that hath seen me hath seen the Father,"—"if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also,"—are to be interpreted on the same general principles. The preposition used (*ἐν*) expresses the inexplicable mutual relations of the Father and the Son—their intimate union—their essential oneness—their joint existence. The phrases employed are designed to show the inseparable connection of the first and second persons in the Trinity ; as we have remarked already, not their unity of plan and purpose merely, but their unity of substance, their oneness of being. Yet even here, the imperfection of language meets us, and mars our interpretation. When we speak of their mutual relation, the nature of that relation is different from any human relation ; and the term *relation*, which is applied to men and to created objects, is not applicable in the same sense to God. So when we use the terms Trinity and Unity in respect to God, we must not think that the threeness or the oneness designated corresponds to any thing equivalent in the relations or mode of existence of any known object. When we use the terms person and personality, we shall err if we imagine them to express the same idea as when we use them of finite beings. What is there in the personality of an infinite being, either in his mode of existence or his relations, equivalent to the personality of a finite mortal ? Even in the use of the adjective pronouns, *his* and *their*, on attentive consideration we are puzzled and confounded, knowing that they must ever be employed to denote the relations of an infinite entity, who is neither one, as men conceive of unity, nor more than one, as men conceive of plurality ; but perfectly unique in all that constitutes being or relations. "Canst thou, by searching, find out God ? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection ?"

That such is the instruction which our Saviour designed to convey is evident from his appeal to his works ; "believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me ; or else believe me for the very works' sake." The point of

the conversation with Philip turned upon the character of Christ;—"have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" Our Lord sought in a few words, recalling what he had said on former occasions, to illumine the dark-minded disciple; and then, as witnesses to his character, he appeals to his words and his works. "Believe me," etc. We have seen the force of his words. His words were confirmed by his works. Of the miracles of Christ, about forty are recorded in the New Testament, besides the frequent assertion that "many were healed," "multitudes were cured," "as many as touched him were made whole," and the like. These miracles were wrought in the various districts of Palestine, in city and village, in the haunts of men and in the wilderness; now in the presence of two or three chosen brethren, and now in the sight of thousands; at one time with so much secrecy that he charged the subjects of them that they should tell no man; and at another, accompanied by the injunction that the healed should proclaim what the Lord had done for them. His miracles extended to all the kingdoms of nature, and appealed to all the senses of men. They possessed the utmost variety in their character, and were often of such a nature as to draw forth, even from his enemies, the unwilling tribute,—"*This was the finger of God.*" By his powerful word he healed inveterate diseases, on which human skill had been exhausted. The demoniac whom no man could tame, came and sat at Christ's feet, "clothed and in his right mind." The dead burst from the grave at his bidding, and was restored to life, and health, and beauty. Thousands of hungry persons are fed by him, by the amazing multiplication of "five barley-loaves and two small fishes." A fish is drawn to the shore, bringing the tribute-money for the Lord and his disciple Peter. Amidst a raging tempest, he walks serenely on the billows, and at his command, the waves are stilled. The number, the variety, and the striking character of the miracles of Christ, their difficulty, speaking after the manner of men, the witnesses of them among the chosen apostles and throughout the land, the permanency of their results, the entire impossibility of fraud in them, and the necessity of the power of a divine agent to perform them, acting whenever and wherever he chose to act,—were all of such a nature as to carry conviction to the mind of the most skeptical. Hence our Saviour



said—"Or else believe me for the very works' sake." What did those works teach? The same that was taught by his words,—*"I am in the Father, and the Father in me."*

"Christ's referring to his works," says Dr. Guyse, "here, as often elsewhere, respects not merely his miracles themselves, but his sovereign, godlike way of performing them by his own divine power, which was the same in him as in the Father; otherwise, those works themselves were no proof of his being in the Father and the Father in him, or of the Father's dwelling in him in any higher sense than the same might be affirmed of the apostles, who, he says in the next verse, should do the same, or greater works than these; much less could it be said that he who had seen him had also seen the Father, unless he had been partaker of the same nature with the Father, and had, in his acting like a divine person, exerted the very same power as resides in the Father himself, and that in such an absolute way as the Father himself would have done it, had he appeared personally and visibly among men. For nothing like this was ever said of the apostles, or any other mere man, because they acted, not by their own, but by Christ's power."

One or two points in these verses require additional remark. In v. 10, our Lord says,—*"The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself, etc."* As Christ, in the context, had plainly alleged the divinity of his character, does he design, in this expression, to disclaim it? Had he no power, as a divine being, of independent action? Having asserted his intimate union, his oneness with the Father, does he here recede from that assertion, and affirm that he is a dependent being, and must look to him, even for the words he is to speak? We think not. Some have attempted to meet the difficulty, by supposing him to speak, in this clause, in his human capacity. But from such we must dissent. It is to be remembered that the disciples and others had been for several years on terms of intimacy with Christ. His form was often before their eyes. His voice was familiar to their ears. They were likely to look upon him as no more than a great prophet of their people—a man of one of their tribes—a fellow-citizen, wonderfully pure in heart and blameless in life, and endowed with a large measure of divine power, but yet as no more than a man of their own race. It was to correct this impression that he

thus spoke; and his words here are in harmony with the sublime character of the rest of the passage. It is as if he had said, 'You do not fully know me. You think me a man, like yourselves. When I speak, you think I speak as a man's heart dictates. You think that as a man, I have an interest of my own. As you look upon my form, you think me governed by the prevailing principles of upright and holy men. But I am not such as you imagine. These words and works, are not the words and works of a mere Jew. I, the seen Teacher, the man Christ Jesus, have not a separate interest, aside from the Father's. I cannot speak nor act, otherwise than the Divinity would and does speak and act? Why? Because I am that Divinity, and cannot act or speak otherwise than, being such, I do act and speak.' "I speak not of myself." In the same manner, we are to explain kindred passages. We give another example. In John 5: 19, it is said, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." And again, John 6: 38, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." It is as if he had said, 'You look on me as a mere man. You think that this outward man, in all appearances like yourselves, directs my movements, and that like yourselves I am swayed wholly and solely by a human will. But it is not so. My will is a higher, a divine one. I do the will of the divine Being; why? Because I am the divine Being.' The Son can do nothing separate from, much less antagonistic to the things which the Father does. Swayed by one will, seeking one end, pervaded by one essence, one in spirit and in being, the Son can do nothing separate from the Father; he can do nothing different from the Father. He must, from the necessity which energizes even the divine nature, do as the Father does. Dr. Clarke remarks, on one of these passages, "Because of his inseparable union with the Father, 'the Son can do nothing of himself;' nor can the Father do any thing of himself, because of his unity with the Son. What things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son. What God does is the work of God, and proper to no creature; Jesus does whatsoever God does, and therefore is no created being." In like manner we are to explain John 5: 30, and similar texts.

The objector may ask, if, by this mode of reasoning, we are not guilty of making the Son the same with the Father—of making the Son, the Father? We answer, 1. So far as one divinity dwells in them, they are one. "I and my Father are one." There is but one God, and the Father is that God; the Son is, also, that God. But, 2. we submit the question, whether we are not sometimes confused in our reasoning by the use of such terms, as even the sacred writers under the guidance of inspiration apply, in the poverty of human language, to the persons of the Trinity? We are apt to think of the term "Son," as if it necessarily and always expressed the relation of affiliation; and of Christ, the Son of God, as if he always were subject to the relation and standing expressed by this term. But it is not necessarily the fact. There is a sense, in which one of the persons in the Trinity sustains the relation of Sonship to another of the persons of the Trinity. But each of these persons sustains other relations, besides, to the Godhead. It is only when the Godhead is contemplated as a Trinity, that the second person sustains the relation of Sonship to the first. The same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of the term Father, as it is applied to one of the persons of the Trinity, and of the relationship designated by that term. We submit, also, whether the title "Father," has not come to be a proper name of God, indicating the supreme Divinity, the universal father of men, without reference to the relations subsisting between the first and second persons of the Trinity—although naturally, and in strict propriety of speech, God is the Father only in respect to his relations to Christ, who is the Son. And although we commonly attach the idea of paternity to the term "Father," it may also be regarded as a conventional term, simply, like the term "God," signifying the supreme Divinity. Prof. Stuart, in commenting on John 1: 1, "The Word was with God, and the Word was God,"—remarks, "I take the word *God* in one case to mean, as in a great number of cases it does mean, God as Father; in the other case, I regard it as a description of divine being, of the Divinity, without reference to the distinction of Father, a use which is very common." If it be employed in such a sense in the verses on which we have been commenting, at least a great portion of the objector's difficulty will be removed.



## ARTICLE V.

## THE DIVINE METHOD OF CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.

THE DIVINE METHOD OF RAISING CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS: *Missionary Paper of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.* Boston, 1844.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE: *A Report on Systematic Benevolence, adopted by the Synod of New York and New Jersey.* New York, 1840.

THE essays, whose names stand at the head of this article, have been addressed to the Christian public by two of the most respectable and efficient of the societies in this country, formed to promote the evangelization of the world. These associations operate in harmony, and are supported, to a great extent, by the same persons. Their field is the world; the first, adopting the pagans abroad, and the second, the destitute at home, as the subjects of their benevolence. From small beginnings, they have already grown up to dignity and power. The days of their infancy are still fresh in the memory of many, who now rejoice to see them moving with a gigantic step, and traversing on errands of mercy, both the eastern and western hemispheres. Together with kindred associations, amongst which they stand in the foremost rank, they present in their recorded results, a fine illustration of the power of the voluntary principle, not only to support the gospel at home, but to execute the great commission, which lays it upon a redeemed church to gain for Christ the allegiance of a revolted world.

The advocates of legal establishments have always insisted that without the fostering care of civil government, the institutions of Christianity must die out, and give place to an active and rampant infidelity. Their argument pays a miserable compliment to the moral power of Christianity. Of this, indeed, most of them have but a dim conception. The heart which has not been truly subdued by the cross, nor felt the glow of a divine philanthropy enkindled there, can have no sympathy with a system which attributes a

moral omnipotence to LOVE, and refuses to trust any other principle to achieve the victories of the church. But if such men would candidly consider the history of associations which, in this free and youthful land, have drawn forth yearly their hundreds of thousands, in order to impart religious teaching to our own destitute population, as well as to the hosts of untaught emigrants whom Europe is constantly sending to our shores,—would consider their inherent energy, their peaceful working, and their capacity for expansion, even they might catch some faint intimation of the truth, that the voluntary system is the divine method for spreading and perpetuating pure religion. In this system, the societies of which we speak, exercise an unwavering faith, as the only system which accords with the letter of the New Testament, and the genius of Christianity. The facts of their history confirm that faith. They have gone onward from strength to strength; they have grappled with unexpected difficulties; they have accomplished what at first seemed to be impossible; and their enterprises now occupy a larger place than ever in the affections of the American church and in the eye of Christendom. Conscious of their moral power, instead of sighing for the benefactions of the State, they crave no interest in its treasury; and even though its aid were proffered, would rather say to it, “let thy gifts be unto thyself, and thy rewards unto another.”

These institutions have now reached a stage of their progress, where they are called to study a new problem, and open their eyes to the meaning and propriety of a specific portion of apostolic teaching. At the outset of their career, their appeals for aid, which fell on the ears of the benevolent and the more wealthy portions of the community, stirred the hearts of all with fresh impulses, and drew forth amounts of contribution adequate to satisfy their increasing demands, and also to meet with honor the most threatening emergencies. Their objects were invested with aspects of grandeur, which awakened the emotion of moral sublimity in every contemplative mind; and they were invested too with aspects of benevolence, which quickened the finest sympathies in the heart of piety. But familiarity with the noblest enterprises tends to obliterate the first impressions which they make; just as we find in the realm of nature, the heights and depths of Alpine scenery, which fill the bosom of the trav-

eller with rapture, are beheld by the dwellers among them with the same listlessness as that which appears in the farmer of New England, when he looks for the millionth time upon the hard soil from which he extorts his bread, and which drank the sweat of his youthful brow. Deep and strong as may be the feeling of patriotism in the heart of a nation, it would be unwise to depend upon its impulses and occasional excitements to supply the funds which are wanted for the daily expenses of the government. The love of country which would pour out freely its blood and treasure at an exciting crisis, could not be calculated upon, amidst the distractions of ordinary cares, to study the occasions of public expenditure, and to adjust its contributions accordingly. In such a case, a financial *system* is necessary, which shall be felt universally, bear on all equally, and operate with the constancy of a law of nature. The same truth applies to the conduct of the great business of the church. A benevolent association, which relies for its support on the excitement of deep emotion, is not adapted to become the source of a wide-spread and permanent power, is not susceptible of a healthy growth, and cannot be depended upon for regular and efficient action. And as the Scriptures show us that voluntary contribution is the divine method of propagating the gospel, it might be naturally expected that they would contain some intimation of a divine method of giving to that contribution the regularity and the force which pertain to a well concerted *SYSTEM*. This would be in accordance with all the works of God, which are ever suggestive of some simple principle, able to secure a systematic adjustment of means to ends. Such a hope is not disappointed. In those epistles, wherein the apostle Paul had occasion to speak on this point, he lays down the rule for benevolent contribution; and it is the design of the essays before us to hold this forth as a divine law, bearing on its front the impress of supreme authority, wisely adjusted as a means to the great ends which Christianity proposes, admirably adapted to the wants of our times, and which, though long neglected, must be observed by the church at large, if she means to fulfil the demands of her Lord, and carry out successfully those works of godlike charity which she hath so auspiciously commenced.



This rule, which is at once concise and comprehensive, is thus stated in the first Epistle to the Corinthians ; (16 : 2.) "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." In his examination of this rule, the writer of the first named essay says,—

1. "It is to contribute frequently and steadily ; 2. it is to contribute universally ; 3. it is to contribute in due proportion ; 4. with order and care. To contribute once in seven days, is to contribute frequently ; yet not too frequently, in order 'to make some appropriate acknowledgment unto God of his right, by giving a portion of what he gives us to carry on his peculiar work in the world, and to save the perishing. Who is it, then, among all his friends, that is to be exempt from the duty ? Who, that is to be deprived of the privilege ? Not one. Due allegiance is expected of all, and due favor is shown to all. It is ordained that every one shall lay by him in store. How suitable and beautiful is this arrangement ! Here the whole church of Christ, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the male and the female, appear before him on the first day of the week. Nor does any one appear empty. Every one lays by him in store an offering, as an acknowledgment of obligation and thanksgiving. This being done frequently and steadily, and on that day of consecration and blessing, it is suited to produce the most happy results.'

"The apostle does not say, however, how much each man should give, only that it should be proportionate to each one's prosperity. Every one is able to exercise his own judgment. God wishes not that we should feel as tributaries, but as friends and children. And that our views may be enlarged, and our affections engaged, he allows us the unspeakable privilege of considering his kingdom as our kingdom, his work as our work, his glory as our glory, and the happiness and glory of all that is achieved and done, as his joy, in which we are permitted to share. With such a work before us, and such results as our ultimate reward, he calls us to take part in the work, with the assurance that every one shall receive a reward according to his own labor."—"Laborers have storehouses. In them they preserve the fruit of their labor. They have also a place for their money ; their iron chest, or some other place of safety. This is their treasury. In this they deposit the results of their industry and frugality. For what ? For the double purpose of order and safe keeping. But where is the man who keeps a treasury for God ? I mean, a place of deposit, in which he may lay up in store, as God has prospered him, his contribution for the relief of the needy, especially of the needy soul. It would be no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that a pious mind would find as much pleasure in thinking of the Lord's treasury, as of his own. It is the testimonial of his heavenly Father's bounty. Every thought of it calls forth a new emotion of love, with a strong desire to do good to the needy. In this treasury, the money is safe, and it is ready. This was one design of the apostle in ordering this deposit—'that there be no gatherings when I come.' He was making collections in Asia and Europe, among the churches of the Gentiles, to relieve the poor saints at Jerusalem. He was the general agent in this concern. As he was passing from one church to another to promote their spiritual

interests, he was willing to take charge of their collections, and be the bearer of them for the relief of the poor. But he did not wish to do what they could do for themselves. Nor did he wish to be diverted or detained from his great work, while their collections were being made. If they would follow his directions, all would be ready. He would receive their bounty, and rejoice with them in their readiness and liberality. Then God would be pleased with their cheerfulness, and honored by the abundance of their contributions and their joy. So in all cases of charitable liberality, if the *divine method* were followed, how pleasant, how delightful would be the aspect of the church! Every member laying by him in store, upon the first day of the week, as God had prospered him, what an abundance would there be for every want! Then, there would be no complaint of hard times; for every one's bounty would be ready. Then, there would be no complaint of too many calls; for on every Lord's day, the store would be replenished. Let there be a call on one Lord's day for the Bible Society; on another, for the Tract Society; on a third, for the Foreign Missionary Society; on a fourth, for the Home Missionary Society; on a fifth, for the Education Society; on a sixth, for the Sabbath School Society; and so on, till all the societies which deserve our aid have called—and then—what? *Let them call again; for again we shall be ready.*"

We believe this to be a just and good exposition of the apostolic direction on this important subject. Whoever will carefully read the eighth and ninth chapters of the succeeding Epistle, will perceive the anxiety of Paul lest the church of Corinth should fail in the cultivation of the spirit of liberality. That church had been reared by his ministry. Situated in a splendid city, whence there was constant communication with all the world, they held a commanding position for the exertion of a Christian influence. Hence, his extraordinary care for them. In many things, they were a joy to him. He had an eye to see, and a heart to love, their points of excellence; wherein they did well, he praised them; wherein they failed, he admonished them, and spurred them on to action. Now, in speaking to them of liberal-giving, he declares to them that other churches far excelled them, and that of this virtue they ought themselves to exhibit a shining example. They did excel in faith, in utterance, in knowledge, in diligence, in affection; but in regard to liberality, they fell behind those of Macedonia. And he beseeches them, that, since he could speak well of them in so many things, they would not be deficient in this. For liberality, he speaks of, as imparting spiritual beauty to the character; that is a "*grace*," which adorns and exalts the soul. Without this, no Christian can be complete, nor attain the end of his calling. He speaks of it,

too, as a virtue which must needs be cultivated, by means of thought, conversation, and practice. "See that ye abound in it," says the apostle to the church for which he himself had made the greatest sacrifices; "I desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would finish this grace in you." Could that voice which was revered in Corinth as the voice of inspired authority, speak to us, would it not say, "Since ye abound in utterance, in love one to another, in privileges, in religious freedom, in resolutions, in meetings for worship, see that ye abound in this grace also; now therefore perform the doing of it, that as there was a readiness to will, so there may be a performance out of that which ye have."

This manner of addressing the church suggests a vivid idea of what sort of a society the Christian church was designed to be, originally. It was to be, not a mere priesthood or hierarchy for the dispensation of sacraments, not a mere party for separate and selfish ends, but a voluntary association of believers to do good. To do good—but how? By mere abstinence from immoralities, by zeal for doctrines, or for meetings, or for proselytes to a name? No; but by the consecration of every talent, faculty, and passion, of time, knowledge, the gift of speech and property, in subordination to the interests of that kingdom which is "not of this world," and of which Christ is the head. Any one who has read the New Testament with due reverence, knows that such an organization the church was designed to be, and such, too, the primitive church was. With such a standard of judgment before him, let him conceive of a rich church, abounding in numbers, and in intelligence, surrounded with the privileges of the Sabbath and the sanctuary, yet, doing almost nothing to promote the cause of Christianity in the world, caring nothing for the poor and destitute, entirely wrapt in the promotion of their own selfish and social aims, nevertheless bearing the name of a *Christian* church, and will he not be struck with a sort of horror at such an abuse of the Christian name? While he is forced to own that such a society of men may be very respectable as to their position in the community, that they may exhibit much that is agreeable in character, and cultivated in manners, yet he cannot but feel the incongruity of their calling themselves, as an association, by the name of Him, who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich, and who said, "it is more blessed to give, than to receive."



The Christian church, then, being, according to its original design, a voluntary association to do good, by liberal giving as well as by other means, it must be remembered that this duty belongs not only to the rich, but also to the poor; for "God despiseth not any," and maketh the widow's mite an acquisition to his treasury. Where there is a right spirit prevailing in such a community, *all* will give from love; and where there is not a right spirit, the possession of all the gold on earth would avail but little to gain for Christ the nations which are his promised heritage.

In the present age, in the American church, and especially within the pale of the Baptist denomination, there is no deficiency so great as in this point of liberal-giving. As to ourselves, there has been no period of our existence when fields so wide and so "white unto the harvest," were thrown open to us; no period when to us, as a church, the voices of benighted millions cried for the gospel with appeals so direct, and in tones so moving. Burmah, Siam, and China call, tribes of the Asiatic mountains hitherto unknown, the forlorn and melancholy Indian of our own continent, and the little churches of civilized Europe in the very heart of nominal Christendom struggling for life, "persecuted but not forsaken, cast down but not destroyed." Those of our own name who have gone before us, who were oppressed for conscience' sake, who were driven by the blasts of persecution over life's stormy ocean, who, like Noah's dove, could find no resting place for their feet—not even a hillock where an olive-branch might grow—men and women, preachers and martyrs, longed to see a day like this, when thousands of churches who profess our common faith can live in a land of liberty, not to receive toleration as a boon, nor merely to possess the privilege of worship as a right, but to enjoy free and ample scope to put forth all their power in extending the conquests of truth through the world. Yet we, who, compared with them, live in a moral Eden, we, on whom are lavished the richest gifts of nature and of providence, sleep over our exalted mission, and do but a tithe of what might be done for that cause which relates to the dearest interests of humanity, and embraces all blessings within itself. The constant laborers, where are they? The thinkers, the planners, the regular and persevering contributors—alas, how few! How astounding, how humbling is the fact, that if each one of our commu-

nicants in the United States, would give regularly but one cent a week, the amount would be thrice as great as our present plan of missionary operations would consume. If the man should ever be raised up who would project some successful mode of systematizing and concentrating the pecuniary power of our churches which now lies dormant amongst a multitude, he would deserve everlasting remembrance, as a benefactor to the church herself and to the race universally. In order, however, to approximate to so great a result, let it become a matter of deep concern to all our readers, and let us endeavor to adopt those plans which shall develop our own resources with a regularity analogous to what we see in the working of those laws by which nature forms the dew and rain to refresh the thirsty earth, or causes ten thousand rills from mountain-top, and hill, and glen, incessantly to pour their little contributions into the channel of the mighty deep.

As an additional incitement and aid in doing this, it may be well to turn our thoughts to some deficiencies in the general character of charitable contributions, practised by Christians of the present day.

1. One deficiency in the benevolence of the age, is found in the fact that it springs so much more from impulse than from principle. There is too much of the power of set occasion, and art, and eloquent appeal, requisite to incite Christians to do what they can. This power is but little needed, where intelligence and principle sway the mind. Who ever thinks of using argument and persuasion to induce an affectionate parent to clothe his children or to support his household? In such a case, the principle of love operates as uniformly as that of gravitation in the material world. But from the cause of Christ, Christians can withhold without pain, without thought. And when they give, too often is the donation thrown into the sacred treasury by a fitful impulse of generosity, like that with which the unthinking sailor, fresh in port, touched by the sight of distress, flings what he has in his pocket at the feet of the first suppliant, without regard to the merits of the case, or the wants of others. This play of feeling in the human bosom is amiable, but it needs to be directed by the forecast of real benevolence. These wild impulses of our common humanity must be brought under the discipline of that Christianity, which, living in the soul as a

principle of action, makes it "wise to do well," and uniformly ready for every good word and work.

2. Another deficiency in the benevolent action of the times, is the disproportion of what is given, on the whole, to the ability of the giver. When an object of charity comes before the mind, it is a question too often asked by the contributor, "how much do people expect from me?" How little can I get off with, respectably? Or, how much does my neighbor, who is worth as much, or more than I am, contribute to this object? Now this may be well enough, when the object is of small importance, or new, or strange, or when its relative claims are doubted. Of such cases, however, we are not speaking here, but of those grand operations of benevolence which are well understood, and are acknowledged to be of tried worth. These enterprises which embrace the evangelization of mankind embody and represent Christ's cause on earth; and when they appeal to us, it is **HE** that speaks; he draws on us, as his stewards, for the payment of what we owe to him; and then, looking beyond human examples, we should say, "Thou, Lord, knowest all my substance, my relations, and my duties—what wouldst thou have me to do?" Once during his earthly life, while his heart yearned over a famishing multitude, instead of supplying their wants immediately by miracle, the Saviour turned towards a disciple, with the touching question, "Whence shall *we* buy bread that these may eat?" "This he said to prove him;" and when, on the wings of every breeze, the appeals of perishing millions have reached our ears, that Saviour's voice might have been heard questioning each disciple, so as to try his heart and see "what he would do."

The apostolic rule of charitable contribution, "every man according to his **ABILITY**," is the only one that is just. The writer of the little work, entitled, "Systematic Benevolence," cites the following remarks to show how much it is neglected.

"Take a few cases illustrative of the principle now maintained. See a person in the middle rank of life: he has an income of two hundred pounds a year; but he has a large family, wholly dependent upon him for their support, and for their future settlement in life. They need every farthing he acquires; but he loves the cause of God, contributes to it in various ways, and from him, a Missionary and a Bible Society each receives an annual pound. Near him resides a Christian friend with a similar income, but no family whatever, and no one dependent upon him; he lives in comfort, and contributes a similar sum to the same



Societies. Is there any reasonable proportion between the liberality of these two persons? One with difficulty parts with what his family needs; the other gives what he scarcely feels. The former denies himself to impart his aid; the latter exercises no self-denial whatever, nor lessens any of his comforts. Near him dwells a third individual; he, too, is professedly a Christian. He has five hundred pounds a year. He lives in the same style as his friends; and when he has defrayed his yearly expenditure, he has three hundred remaining to lay by. Out of this, he gives a similar subscription to the same Societies. Now is there any comparison between the generosity of the first individual and this latter? The first squeezes his subscription out of a sum that will barely defray his expenditure; the last presents his from what forms, as far as the present time is concerned, an unneeded surplus. The first cannot lay up a single pound; the last lays up his hundreds, and by them is continually accumulating more. The first deducts his two pounds from an income that will barely supply his wants; but he denies himself, that he may contribute that sum. The last gives but the hundred and fiftieth part of a surplus above his wants. Would he vie with his less wealthy neighbor in liberality? It is evident that he must contribute not his two pounds, but his surplus three hundred pounds, to the cause of God. Worldly-minded professors of religion may laugh at and scorn this remark; but its correctness is evidently founded on principles which they may deride, but cannot overthrow."

3. Another deficiency in the benevolence of the day is, that even in the united action of churches who may be supposed to give from principle, so much is done apart from any system of action which embraces alike all classes within its scope. However few may go to the utmost extreme of secrecy in their charities, too many cherish the spirit of one who said, "What I give, I give by myself, and not in connection with others; I give when I please, as I please, and let not my left hand know what my right hand doeth." Poor man! though he quoted scripture, little did he think how much he perverted it. For that passage has reference only to the subject of alms-giving to the poor, which, from regard to their feelings, if from no other motive, ought to be private, and which the Pharisees, of whom Christ was speaking, made a conspicuous show. But great public objects must be promoted by concerted efforts and in a systematic manner. So, when the poor widow, along with others, threw her mite into the public treasury, Jesus not only noticed it, but bade others behold it, and take a lesson from her example.

When Paul gave to the church in Corinth the rule for charitable contribution, of which we have spoken, he was anticipating the pleasure of a visit to that city. Desirous to give his whole attention to their spiritual interests, and to cre-

ate no special excitement about money, he urged the Corinthians to have their collections ready, by each one's laying by him in store, upon the first day of the week, according to his ability, a portion of his property; assigning his reason in the following words—"that there be no gatherings when I come." He wished Corinth to help him in his work, from principle, systematically, and quietly. Now, if that church had been affected with the modern spirit of religious enterprise, they would have been quite disposed to treat his reason with little respect, and to have said, why, after Paul's arrival will be the very time for making the collection; and his presence, his eloquence, his apostolic authority, will have a great effect. Then we shall be all excited; the people will be all glad to see him, and it will be easy to open their purses, and accomplish the whole work at once. Men are never so ready to give as when they *feel well*; and if Paul comes to preach to us, we shall all feel exactly right. Next, in some meeting of the church, would have been heard something to this intent: 'Resolved, that the collections in question be deferred, until after the apostle Paul shall have arrived in Corinth.' But can we imagine that he would have been pleased with such a compliment to his eloquence and his power of moving men? No. He would have spoken to them in a strain similar to that which he afterwards uttered; "I spoke by occasion of the forwardness of others to prove the sincerity of your love. For it was expedient for you who have begun before, not only to do, but to have been forward a year ago."

It deserves to be considered that the apostolic method of benevolence embraces five particulars, which ought to be well fixed in our memories. These are,

1. That charitable contribution should be conducted according to a *system*.

2. That this system should be all-pervasive;—"let *every* man lay by him."

3. That this systematic appropriation of funds should be made *frequently*—as often as once a week.

4. That the amount designated for this purpose should be considered no longer as one's own. When "laid by in store,"—such is the scriptural phrase—it is never more to be *subject to the liabilities* of the rest of one's property.

5. This weekly study and calculation of the amount of one's contribution, should lead each to give to an extent

commensurate with his power—"according to his ability,"—or "as God has prospered him."

Here is the development of an apostolic plan of charity, fitted to universal adoption; a system of God's ordering—simple, equal, rational, efficient, requiring nothing to sustain it in any church disposed to receive it, but that love to Christ which will keep them from forgetting him longer than a week at a time. If we have real love to him, whether the church be rich or poor, that system would be found to be self-sustaining. The result of a fair trial in any church, would lead all joyfully to say, see how much better are God's ways than man's—and the hints of Scripture, than the volumes of man's wisdom. The primitive Christians generally believed this; hence, how united, how noiseless, how efficient they were! Their system of agency was mighty and far-reaching; yet quiet as the gentle dew which moistens the arid clod, or the solar heat which releases the earth from the hoar frost, and makes a genial vegetation spring.

When Paul asks that there might be no special gatherings for this object after his arrival, we can easily believe that his feelings would have been disturbed by a great show of money-getting. He desired that there might be nothing of this. He wished to touch the fountains of charity in every Christian's bosom, that the perennial stream might flow forth evermore, and pour its golden contribution without ceasing into the Lord's treasury, and thence over the waste of blighted humanity, so as to make that waste to bloom, and turn the desert into an Eden.

Some have taken it for granted, we think inadvertently, that every Sabbath, in the church at Corinth before Paul visited them, there was a passing around of plates, and a jingling of money during the service. But the passage quoted contains no intimation of this sort. The "laying by in store," was surely a noiseless thing, and there is no evidence that the collection was made during public worship. And without evidence, it ought not to be asserted. It is more probable that there were persons appointed to take the money and send it to its destination. This would be the least showy, and the most effective mode. And it is just for want of a like simplicity of purpose, of this constant and united labor in the work of well-doing, that our liberality falls so far short of its proper standard. Do we not depend



too much on occasional public efforts, which seek to accomplish, three or four times a year, that which ought to be the work of every week? If the true idea of a church, be that of a voluntary association of Christians to do good according to the gospel, then, ought not every man, woman and child among them to be considered as a pledged contributor of course, whether, or not, the name of the individual be subscribed to a preamble, touching this or that particular enterprise? If the cardinal objects of benevolence represent the cause of Christ on earth, then should they not all be dear to us? Undoubtedly. In view of the whole subject, then, we will close this article by offering two or three practical suggestions.

1. Since liberal-giving for the spread of the gospel is the serious business of the whole church, let every member feel his obligation to *share the labor* of sustaining an efficient system of benevolence. In this work, the youngest may do something. Does the reader hear the very youngest ask—what can I do? Say to him, as has been said in a similar case, “you can lay by in store your cent a week, perhaps, more. You can probably induce some one else to do the same. You can remind your parents, brothers, or sisters, of the week’s contribution, and suffer none around you to forget it.” And if the youngest can do something, all others can. The Head of the church expects all to do something. This business of the church is the most noble which mortals can perform. In the eyes of angels, the largest mercantile transactions at the exchange are of small importance compared with this. Art, science, trade, commerce, industry, are all justly subservient to the establishment of that kingdom whose final triumph angels shall celebrate, when they shall exclaim, in the voice of song, “honor, and power, and glory, and riches, and dominion, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne.”

2. The great secret of success, in sustaining a pervasive system of benevolence, is involved in a proper division of labor. Without labor, no system can be sustained at all. The chief need of labor, in that noiseless and efficient plan of which we have spoken, is in drawing in the stated contributions seasonably, by means of the personal application of collectors. But where a church has been properly divided, and collectors, male and female, found for each

division, the system has been always prolific in good results. The writer on "Systematic Benevolence," cites this illustration.

"A church in the country, of 500 members, has conducted its charitable efforts for ten years, pleasantly and efficiently, in the following manner:

"The church holds an annual business meeting, about the first of January. The question comes up, to what charitable objects will this church contribute during the year? Various objects are proposed, and a selection is made. Months are designated for the presentation of the claims of each of these causes to the congregation on the Sabbath. A *committee* of three gentlemen is appointed for each of these objects, whose duty it is, 1. To confer with the pastor respecting the particular Sabbath in the month for bringing forward the claims of their respective objects, by the pastor or an agent, as the case may be. 2. To meet immediately after the public appeal; divide the congregation into four, five, or six districts as may be necessary, and appoint *one male, and one female collector* for each district; furnish them with blank books, in which to take the names of contributors, and the amount given, requesting these collectors to call on every member of the congregation within their respective districts, not known to be unfriendly to the objects presented, and make a report to the committee, at the expiration of two weeks. 3. To receive the money from the collectors, and pay it over to the treasury for which it was designed, and at the annual meeting of the church in January, make a report of their doings.

"The pastor and the chairman of each of these committees are appointed by the church as a distinct committee, to whom are to be referred all applications in behalf of other benevolent objects that may present themselves in the course of the year. If these objects are such as it is thought best to aid, times are designated for hearing their claims, such as will least interfere with the stated collections; or perhaps, the aid is rendered in another form by a contribution in the congregation, or by personal application to a few individuals.

"The annual meetings of the church, in which reports are presented, showing what has been done in the course of the year, and in which the course of action for another year is marked out, are meetings of unusual interest. The pastor sometimes incorporates the several reports into one general statement; or if the reports are presented by the chairmen of the committees, he addresses the church, and perhaps, introduces others to address them, on topics naturally suggested at such an anniversary."

One great advantage of adhering to a plan like this, is that a number of little societies for distinct objects has been found useless. The church has been saved from a distracting multiplicity of associations, mostly moving in the same circle, and the friction of this internal machinery has ceased. In every church, the problem of an efficient system of benevolence seems to depend for its solution, on the question, can there be obtained a sufficient number of persevering collectors?

3. Is it not probable, that, if all professing Christians who are friendly to the cause of benevolence, should commence this scriptural process of a weekly tax on themselves, "according to their ability," the aggregate would exceed any thing which the church has yet accomplished, or which she now dreams of? There is reason to believe that she could do more than she has done, and yet feel it less. If every parent would procure for his family a money-box, and encourage each of his children to save weekly for the cause of Christian charity, he might be implanting within the child's expanding character, a germ of liberality, which, in succeeding years, would bloom, bear fruit, and fill the world with its fragrance and beauty. And if thus we increase the amount of seed sown to the glory of Christ, we increase the harvest of our happiness hereafter; for "he that soweth sparingly, shall reap also sparingly, and he who soweth bountifully, shall reap also bountifully."

---

ARTICLE VI.

SECOND ADVENTISM.

BY THE EDITOR.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES FOR OCT. 16, 1844.

THE ADVENT SHIELD AND REVIEW. No. 1. VOL. I.  
May 1844.

FOR the last few months, several portions of our American community have witnessed the development of fanaticism in a new direction. Pretending to clearer revelations of divine truth than have ordinarily fallen to the lot of Christians, learned or unlearned, and to a more accurate and profound understanding of inspired prophecy than has hitherto prevailed, the leaders of this heresy have set themselves up to be admired and respected by their misguided followers. For a considerable period they have kept up a fermentation within a limited circle of the community. With the progressive development of their revelations, the circle has somewhat enlarged. Some of their number have been disposed to



regard with jealousy the attempt to fix upon a determinate day, on which the present relations of material things should cease, and the final destruction of the world take place. With pious hesitation, or with fraudulent cunning, they have wisely forbore to expose their cause to so easy and tangible a defeat, as would necessarily be endured, in case the predicted day should pass by, and the event still tarry. But of late, by some apparently desperate impulse, the chief fomenters of this tumult have agreed upon an appointed day, as the day of the final consummation. In respect to this day, there was an almost entire harmony of views—expressed both by those who had designated previous days, as the occasion of that event, and by those who, on any account, had declined such an act of self-committal. Filled with expectations of the most amazing scenes which were to be revealed on that day, and confident that there was no possibility of delusion, many of the victims of this fancy, as the time drew nigh, gave up their secular employments, distributed their property gratuitously, left their crops ungathered in the field, spent most of their time in disorderly and fanatical meetings, such as were suited to confirm them in the faith, and finally, on the appointed day, assembled in several places in large numbers in the open fields, or bivouacked in tents, exposed to the inclemencies of the damp and stormy autumn,—to wait for the descent of the Lord from heaven.

They waited, but he did not descend. And the dupes of this extraordinary exhibition of human folly, ignorance, and perverseness, blind followers of the blind, live to see the falsity of the scheme by which they have been led astray. The bubble, we are happy to say, has burst; not in such a way as to leave room for the leaders, if they are honest men, to rally their associates, and carry on the delusion; but providentially, after all the magnates of the sect had publicly staked every thing upon a single result. That result has failed. The credit of the system, if it ever had any, with reasoning and judicious persons, is, of course, irretrievably lost. Under these circumstances, we can examine, more favorably than at any former time, the causes in which so baseless a vision had its birth. We are no longer in danger of impinging against a theory; for the theory is now defunct. All that constituted its distinguishing features, all which gave it a temporary influence over a certain class of

minds, all which made it a matter of notice in the community, has now vanished away. Time has shown its folly, and convicted the blind abettors of it, of error and fanaticism.

What is second-adventism? We answer, whatever it be, the only feature of it which has given it any degree of currency in the community, is the single article, that the second coming of Christ, to judge the world, was to take place in the year 1843; or, as the more recent theory has maintained, on the twenty-second or twenty-third of October, 1844. If it maintain any other important articles, as its adherents have sometimes taught that one of its doctrines is, that the millennial reign of Christ, so called, is to commence after the final judgment,—neither this latter nor any other point, has created the flurry which has existed in the community. The other and main position is that which has filled the mouths of itinerant lecturers, kept in motion printing-presses, raised up, temporarily, a new sect, dragged weak brethren and sisters out of the churches, and taught them to anathematize those with whom they used to take sweet counsel, occasionally thronged their disorderly conventicles, withdrawn men from their social and civil duties, and sent many to our hospitals, as maniacs. This point is the essence of the theory; and, this having vanished away, as time has proved it false, nothing remains. The cornerstone has decayed, and the fabric, therefore, must fall in ruins.

We blame this theory and its abettors, because they seem almost to assume that the doctrine of the second advent of Christ to judge the world had ceased to be preached. These new advocates of error have risen up, as if to restore an item which had fallen out from the evangelical creed; as sound and practical views of regeneration had generally disappeared from amongst the people, when Whitefield and his coadjutors began to preach in demonstration of the Spirit, and with power. But such a tacit charge, is any thing but true. We had not, indeed, preached that the second coming of Christ was to take place on a given day. To that we judged human beings incompetent. Our attention was not expended in ciphering out for our hearers, curious problems about the time of its occurrence. But that Christ will come the second time to judge the world in righteousness, is a doctrine which has been largely

proclaimed from every evangelical pulpit, day and night, for years and centuries; and they know it. We have not shunned to declare, on this topic, the whole counsel of God; but they have declared, as the result has shown, what was not the counsel of God. Sensible as we are of our manifold deficiencies, we believe that on this point, the evangelical ministry are much less chargeable with negligence, than they, with excess.

Several of the causes of this delusion are easy to be detected. Many persons, who have assumed to be interpreters of the Scriptures, were incompetent to the task. If they have possessed some of the points required in a good interpreter, they have lacked others which are of vital importance. A good interpreter of the Bible should have ardent piety, familiarity with the original Scriptures, extensive learning, an acquaintance with the classics, and skill in expounding them, a knowledge of sacred and civil history, of geography, and of the archæology of the Jews and other nations, treated of in the sacred record. The want of any one of these qualifications is a capital defect. He who knows little or nothing of the original Scriptures, is liable to pronounce opinions based on the forms of the English version, which the words of the inspired writer do not sanction. The treasures opened in the fields of learning may, in many cases, guide a man to opinions, which, with a more limited amount of information, he would have overlooked, or rejected. They may also lead him to reject opinions, which, with more limited information, he would have adopted. Familiarity with classical authors, and skill in expounding them, not only puts a man in possession of some of the most important requisites of hermeneutical skill, but also opens his eyes to many things, which an inexperienced interpreter would pass unnoticed. Ecclesiastical and civil history furnishes the materials of enlarging the critic's field of vision, warning him of the rocks of error on which others have foundered, and showing the manner in which the providence of God has corresponded with his word. Geography and archæology illustrate and confirm many things which are doubtful, open the meaning of allusions otherwise obscure, and show the point and force of texts, which, to an unlearned reader, speak a language either indefinite or unintelligible. It is not meant for a reproach on the men who have been at



the foundation of this excitement, when we say, that most of them are deficient in the chief of these requisites. It is a necessary result of their circumstances. Many of them have spent their lives in pursuits that preclude them from making high literary attainments. Their condition and early habits have forbidden them to be scholars. But, for this reason they should have been more modest in setting up their claims as teachers. They should have been more wise than to denounce men of higher opportunities and larger information, and whose profound and extensive inquiries, with all the requisites of exegetical skill, have led them to a different understanding of the word of God. They should have sat at their feet as learners; or, certainly, they should have suspected their own conclusions to be wrong, when they have differed from the views of men of distinguished ability and experience. We ask this deference, not because we are not all brethren; not because we would set up one, in unbrotherly distinction, above another; not because we would assert the claim of any of Christ's servants to be called "Rabbi, Rabbi;" but because it is reasonable to expect that men who have spent their lives among books, should have some literary ability beyond those whose duties have called them into other spheres; as we should expect the experienced artizan to be more skilful than the young apprentice; or the sculptor, in the manhood and power of his art, to excel the efforts of the young aspirant for fame the first time he lays his hand upon the graving tool. If these men are not to be blamed for their want of ability, they are to be blamed for their want of modesty.

Especially have they erred, as we think, in their assertion that they have been taught of the Spirit above others; and that the Spirit has delighted to pass by the instructed and experienced expounders of God's word, and to make these new revelations to the unlearned. In respect to the sentiment itself, we have to say that it contains an obvious mistake. It is not in harmony with the divine promise, or with God's ordinary plan of procedure. If they for whose right we plead as the more competent interpreters, were of the worldly wise and prudent, the boastful scribe, the self-righteous Pharisee, and their opponents were the only humble, holy men on earth, then, we admit that God might vouchsafe to the latter, special assistance in the discovery of the mean-

ing of his written word, above that which he should give to the former. But where these superior qualifications of humility and piety, so far as appears, do not distinguish the latter class above the former, we cannot but think that the clearer, and the better-founded interpretation would be likely to come from those, who, in all other respects, are the more competent. The case of these new expounders is different from the case of the early Christians; and they have no right to claim peculiar kindredship with them, as to the matter of special divine communications. Many, it is true, are ever ready to yield themselves up to those who seem to manifest ingenuity in spiritualizing literal history and facts, in discovering mysterious significations under the plain letter of the divine word, in detecting a typical sense, where common eyes see only that which is obvious and primary, in forcing out a striking meaning from unconnected verses, which is sanctioned neither by the connection of the context, nor by the analogy of faith. But the number of a man's followers is no test of his correctness. The assertion, that they are taught, peculiarly of the Spirit, is, moreover, exceedingly devoid of modesty. Why should any man, in a spirit of self-praise, say to his neighbor, "I am better than thou?" And last of all, the event has proved, that, after all their boasting of divine communications, they were not taught of the Spirit. Whether they took counsel of their own ignorance, or were deluded by the father of lies, or both, we have no right, perhaps, to say. It is enough to remark, that, confident as they were of the teachings of the Spirit, on this point, at least, the Spirit did not teach them; they received from the Spirit no communications; they were not distinguished by God above others, whom they railed at as the worldly-wise. In the might of their exegetical boasting, they interpreted the Scriptures falsely, believed and propagated a delusion, condemned ministers and churches with censoriousness without a reason, and now, at last, their theory has fallen to the ground, "like the baseless fabric of a vision."

The tumult which these people have awakened is, therefore, in part, at least, a result of deficient hermeneutical information. There were mistakes at the basis of their theory, which they had not the ability to detect. They had learned the rules of interpretation neither from books

nor men; and when they undertook to act as interpreters with false rules, or with no rules at all, at the very outset they fell into mistake. He who would be a skilful interpreter must be taught how to interpret. He requires experience in the exposition of the classical authors. Many things, as we have shown, are needed to fill up the circle of instruction, by which any one is to become an accomplished expounder of the Scriptures; and the acquisition of the necessary qualifications must, from the nature of the case, be the work of time, the fruit of laborious study, the effect of diligence, experience and patience. We see, therefore, the value of good theological schools, where the elements of hermeneutics are effectually taught. The whole history of this delusion is, in our view, an argument in favor of competent theological instruction. It is a standing testimony to the worth of our institutions at Newton and elsewhere. True, an objector may say, some of the graduates of those very institutions have been among the leaders of the delusion. We grant it. But, at the same time, we hold that the institutions are free from blame. The wild fanaticism by which some have been carried away, who pursued a three years' course in the shades of their retirement, is not a fruit of the canons of criticism there taught. The students who have started off in such an erratic orbit, have swerved from the principles which their teachers had laid down. They have forsaken the safe path of calm, clear investigation, to follow the meteors of the ignorant and the deluded, becoming followers of the error of those whom they ought rather to have swayed and led into the truth. From such a course, the instructions of their professors, if they had been heeded, would have preserved them. Many a man, unfortunately, reaps little profit from the best opportunities; and it is not to be wondered at, if a few of the students of our approved institutions, too self-confident to learn, have forsaken the principles in which they were instructed, and sunk into error and delusion. But, if it were not for our well-regulated schools of sacred science, how many others, who now maintain their integrity, might have been led away, to the ruin of their usefulness, and the irretrievable damage of their followers!

Another ground of the error which has swept around us is a misunderstanding of the nature of scriptural types. This



is the latest phase of this false and injurious theory. The time has been when divines have displayed their ingenuity in matching types in the Old Testament with their antitypes in the New ; and their works have been esteemed, in proportion to their accumulations of such correspondences of the modern with the ancient dispensation. Scarcely a personage or an event appears in the Old Testament, or an item of service, or a circumstantial detail is written in the ceremonial law, which has not been spiritualized, as typical of something under the Christian economy. For example, we have lately been told that the jubilee release among the Jews was typical of the world's last year, and we have been pointed to a particular day, on which the Judge was to descend from heaven, because on a day, which was supposed to correspond to it in time, some event regarded as typical took place in the Jewish ceremonial. But such reasoning from supposed types is very unsafe. We are not sure that by particular arrangements, events or personages, described in the Old Testament, God designed to prefigure corresponding arrangements, events or personages under the New Testament economy, unless we have the testimony of the Holy Spirit, showing what are designed as types, and what correspondent things are to be viewed as the fulfilment of those types. If we apply the supposed types according to our own judgment, without any inspired rule, every man may give his own interpretation ; and, so far as appears, each may have an equal foundation, each may be equally correct, or equally incorrect. Thus, that which appears in the Old Testament may be a type of this, or a type of that, or a type of neither of the two ; and one type may have many antitypes, according to the views of as many different interpreters. Reasoning in such a manner, we may prove that an event will certainly take place on a given day, as, the end of the world ; but having no assurance that we have rightly applied the type, we cannot be certain, as has recently occurred, whether that which is regarded as a type, has any such meaning, or whether we have been led by it to a decision in respect to time, which does not come within scores, or hundreds, or thousands of years of the true time of the event designated. So far as our assumed type is concerned, the event may be, or it may not be ; if it should be, we shall not have proved it on such grounds, but only conjectured it, and, by accident, conjectured rightly. Ernesti says, "The design of the Holy

Spirit in the mention of this or that thing in the Scriptures can be understood only so far as he has himself explained it, or afforded obvious grounds of explanation." "If it be asked," says Professor Stuart, "how far are we to consider the Old Testament as typical,—I should answer, without any hesitation—just so much of it is to be regarded as typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, and no more. The fact that any thing or event under the Old Testament dispensation was designed to prefigure something under the New, can be known to us only by revelation; and, of course, all that is not designated by divine authority as typical, can never be made so by any authority less than that which guided the writers of the Scriptures." The opinion recently set forth, that the second advent of our Lord was to take place on the twenty-second or twenty-third day of October last, was founded, so far as we are informed, on an argument of a typical nature, constructed out of the day of atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month (Lev. 23: 27.) Time has already shown that the argument was baseless. The Holy Spirit did not acknowledge its validity. The providence of God has put it to shame.

The interpreting of texts taken out of their scriptural connection, and the pressing of texts to the expression of an extravagant meaning, beyond the intent of the sacred writers, may be regarded, also, as among the elements of this error. There is a notable instance of the first of these in the typical interpretation of the passage mentioned in the last paragraph. Any one who looks at the thirty-fourth and thirty-ninth verses of the same chapter (Lev. 23), will find that directions are given in reference to days succeeding the tenth day, which they affirmed to be typical of the world's last day. But, as they assumed that the directions and events contained in this chapter are typical of the end of the world, it is incumbent upon them to show, of what events, after the world has been destroyed, these subsequent ones are typical; which, we suspect, would not be so easy. An example of the second is found, especially in the arguments by which the theory called 'Perfectionism,' has been maintained. Passages of one class have been urged to the extreme meaning of their words, and the modifications of their sense required by other passages, entirely neglected. If the rules of interpretation, applied to the texts on which they rely, were applied to the texts of the opposite class, which are fitted to qualify and guard their

sense, the doctrine of perfection, now maintained to be possible, could just as easily and necessarily be shown to be impossible. There has been, also, an extravagance in giving spiritual significations to that which is obviously to be understood literally. The apostle shows that "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly." But it by no means follows, that the prophecies relating to the Jews should be understood of the children of God, specifically, without reference to their nationality. We have no right to forsake the literal sense, without some obvious reason. If we may do so, the Bible ceases to have an exact and intelligible meaning. We are cast upon a wide ocean, without chart or compass to guide us, without sun, moon or star to direct our course. We are in danger every day of running upon shoals and rocks, and of perishing through our ignorance of the will of God.

Another error has been the fixing, in the beginning, of the point to be proved, and then making every thing bear towards the proof of it. The argumentation on the whole subject, so far as argument has appeared, has been of that sort denominated by grammarians a *hysteron proteron*. Having watched the method of the sect, we think we are guilty of no uncharitable judgment, when we say, that most of their followers, not to say, of their leaders also, seem to have agreed upon "the time of the end," and then to have forced both prophecy, arithmetic and history into a conformity with it. The misguided father of the system, in his bungling interpretation, may, perhaps, have stumbled upon a given period, which first set the ball in motion. But the idea being once originated and the nucleus of the system formed, around that point every thing was immediately made to gather, like crystallizing particles around a central mass. The adherents of the error, setting out from this point, proceeded, with little discrimination, to draw together arguments in favor of their theory from various sources; from each of them they contrived to deduce their distinguishing conclusion; and, among themselves and their friends, these arguments and conclusions would, doubtless, have still seemed very legitimate, had not time showed the worthlessness of the whole. If one system of chronology did not suit their purpose throughout, they selected another, from which those portions might be adopted and amalgamated with the other, which were favorable to their own views. If a literal interpretation of any passage mili-



tated against them, they found no difficulty in spiritualizing or allegorizing it; and, on the contrary, if a spiritual interpretation did not serve them, they could as easily adhere to the literal. And, if the period designated for the consummation turns out to be premature, the whole company find it perfectly easy to settle upon another, and to maintain it as firmly as if the former had never entered into their calculation. But such a mode of proceeding is the death of liberal investigation. The object of investigation is to inquire what is truth; not to prove that a certain preconceived notion *is* truth. We enter upon it, in order to discover what is revealed; not to find proof that a certain order of things *is* revealed. It is in consequence of this erroneous method of investigation and reasoning, that the near approach of the second advent has been proved again and again, since the commencement of the Christian era; that different periods have been fixed for it with equal certainty, and, when one and another has failed, the proofs that still another time is the time appointed of Heaven, have been equally abundant and clear. Could these discrepancies co-exist with right principles of interpretation, with right modes of investigation? Is there not evident error of method, when so many successive theories, on whose truth men have staked every thing, have successively turned out to be false?

It has been the error of the abettors of second adventism that they have not allowed sufficient weight to opposing considerations. There are, it is well known, such antagonist views. Their opponents can speak, as truly as they. And the validity of an argument is in proportion to the absence of strong reasons against it, or the removableness of the objections by the sound and sober exhibition of truth and fact. A good argument can sustain and repel the force of opposition. If it shrinks from resistance, or by any sophistry avoids it, or, by an incorrect method of interpretation, eludes the searching hand of criticism, its value, as an argument, is effectually compromised. Its light avails no more than darkness. But such has been the method of these errorists. They have sought to elude the arguments of their opponents by a worthless and unfounded exegesis. They have not refuted them by fair reasoning, nor shown their falsity, according to the approved laws of hermeneutics. On the contrary, they have denounced those who differ from them. They

have, in many instances, denied the piety of ministers and churches who have not agreed with them. They have made belief in their particular views, in the distinguishing article of their faith, essential to salvation. And in the end they have come to a position, in which they have seemed to look upon all that dissented from their theory, with less of pity, than of contempt. This has been the error of the system,—a system, which, by the moral influence it has wrought upon its adherents, has shown itself to be a system of falsehood, and not of truth.

Finally, they have manifested a want of discernment. Deluded by the all-absorbing importance of one idea, they have not discriminated between things that differ. This is partly an error incident to persons of deficient education. The edge of the mind has no keenness to detect minute differences. They are deceived by words, standing in the place of things. They are misled by forms of speech. They erroneously judge that when two events, separated by the lapse of many ages, can be described in words nearly similar, one of the events is designed to be typical and prophetic of the other; and because some things, under the ancient dispensation were types of what has taken place under the new, they find it difficult to conceive that all other things, which have even a distant analogy to others apparently responding to them, are not typical also.

But these things, we trust, have reached and passed their crisis. The storm of excitement has spent itself. It is reported that some of the leaders have made public confession of their ignorance and folly. How far their confessions extend, we know not. But if they are of any value, we are sure they ought to extend to the entire and eternal abandonment of their destructive theories, to a return with humility and penitence to the bosom of the church, and to such restitution as it may be in their power to make for the evil they have done to the community. Any repentance less than this, we deem wholly inadequate to the exigencies of the occasion. We can scarcely believe, however, that the party which has sprung from this delusion and nourished it, is at an end. Human nature does not so easily relinquish that upon which it has staked so much. Other elements of de-organization, anarchy, universal equality, unrestricted liberty, selfishness, pride and similar evils, have entered into

the breasts of many of its abettors, so that we have reason to fear that they may continue to maintain a distinct existence for a considerable time. Ultimately, we believe that the truly worthy among them, convinced of their error and sin, will become reconciled to their respective churches, and again walk in love with their brethren, "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The rest, we fear, will go over into ultraist views on all topics of prevailing interest, as their evident tendency has been hitherto, and finally sink into the abyss of a vulgar infidelity. How consoling to the Christian, amid the heaving of the billows and the beating of the storm that has now begun to be assuaged, that "the Lord sitteth King upon the flood;" and while error and sin, rushing forth to seize their victims, assail all the secret springs of society, and shake its soundest and strongest supports, "the foundation of the Lord standeth sure."

---

## ARTICLE VII.

## LETTERS ADDRESSED TO JOHN VON MÜLLER.

*Briefe an Johan von Müller, Supplement zu dessen sämtlichen Werken*, (Letters addressed to John von Müller as a Supplement to his Complete Works), herausgegeben von Maurer-Constant. Schaffhausen, 6 vols. 1839-40.

Few great and good men have been held in such various estimation as John von Müller. The two works on which his literary fame chiefly rests, are his History of Switzerland, and his History of the World. Heeren and Niebuhr apparently pass directly opposite judgments upon him as a historian, the former in his favor, the latter to his discredit. He has justly been called the Tacitus of German historians. Of his mature scholarship, there is, and can be, no question. His investigations were unusually extensive, and were always pushed to the very sources. In bold historical combinations, in rigidity in the criticism and cross-questioning of his witnesses, he is undoubtedly deficient; and so far, Niebuhr's declaration is true. But in fidelity, in correct general im-



pressions, in the power of seizing upon great social and political principles, in minuteness and accuracy of detail, in a generous enthusiasm for every thing noble and great, in freshness of interest, and in vividness of representation,—he is hardly excelled by any historical writer of his country; and in this respect, the general public voice will support the decision of Heeren. That his style has the faults which mark the style of Tacitus, that, in aiming to be energetic and pithy, he became somewhat affected, and, at times, obscure, and consequently failed of the charming simplicity of a Xenophon or a Cæsar, is evident to all. Wieland gave him a gentle hint of this very early, as we learn from one of his letters in this collection. Müller was a contributor to the *Mercury*, edited by Wieland. One article was returned, that a few faulty and obscure paragraphs might be revised. Wieland recommended a historical style between those of Xenophon and Thucydides; and with reference to Müller's occasional obscurity, added, "Quintilian says, perspicuity is the first requisite of oratory; perspicuity is the second; perspicuity is the third. *Ora pro nobis, sancte Quintiliane.*"

It is a great pity that Müller attempted to be a politician, and eagerly sought a place at some of the German courts. It diverted him, in part, from his true calling; it did not give him that independence and repose which he anticipated, and, as he was not sufficiently firm in his political character to meet such a crisis as that which took place in Germany at the time of the French revolution, he has left behind him an equivocal character in respect to political consistency. Of his personal virtue and honesty, of his high moral aims through life, there is no just reason to doubt. His character was faulty by defect, rather than by any thing positively wrong. If, on this point, there had been any question before, the present correspondence is adapted to remove it entirely. None but a prejudiced mind can peruse these letters, without receiving a deep impression of the purity and moral elevation of Müller's character. Such friendship as is breathed throughout this correspondence with a large number of the most eminent men of the times, running, in many instances, through his whole life, is scarcely reconcilable with the supposition that Müller was a heartless time-server. He appears, from these letters, to be perfectly independent and manly; and, in most of the cases of incidental misun-

derstanding with his friends, the explanations came from the other side, and Müller, without change of character or conduct, not only won, but retained all hearts. The entire correspondence of Müller—his own letters making ten volumes in his works, and those of his friends, six volumes in the present collection,—is a remarkable monument of warm and permanent friendship. In most cases, he is the idol of the hearts of his correspondents; so much so that the English reader, in his phlegm, will be more likely to find fault with these enthusiastic out-pourings of devoted affection, than with any other feature of the work.

Not only do the letters, addressed to Müller, illustrate his life and character, but they throw new light upon many portions of the literary and political history of the times. The public history of the period in which he lived has long been before us; but the secret springs of the policy and course of events, the private motives, the principles and the actions of influential statesmen and warriors, their conflicting views and interests, and the effect which these had in producing that motley mixture, that unseemly patch-work, called public measures in the German courts, are brought out in some parts of this correspondence as they are nowhere else. The letters of von Genz, and of von Dohm, are the most interesting for the political disclosures they make. Genz was a Prussian by birth and education, but, during most of his political life, a member of the Austrian cabinet. He was the chief secretary of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, and of others that were held soon after, and has a high reputation for skill in drawing up state-documents. The Austrian proclamation of war, written by Genz in 1813, is regarded as a model of that style of composition. Being connected with the Austrian court during the whole period of Napoleon's career, he was enabled to explain the course of things to his friend Müller more completely than most others, who saw these things only in their results, and from without. The policy of the Austrian court, in particular, and the winding threads of its intrigues, are laid completely bare in the splendid, but indignant, and sometimes acrimonious correspondence of this statesman. The invasion and easy conquest of Austria by Napoleon, in 1805, has left a general impression of the weakness and stupidity of that nation, difficult to be ac-

counted for. Genz makes some statements which serve to explain the matter. In giving the grounds of the change in the war department, by which General Mack was brought into power, as quarter-master general, he makes some interesting statements which may serve as a specimen of his manner.

“The change is owing to a variety of causes combined. The Emperor and his ministry were displeased with the power which the Archduke assumed in the *details*. They desire to have all these pass first under their review. This and a secret jealousy of Fasbender’s influence, were unquestionably the chief motives. To these were added two others; first, the general complaint that the public funds were squandered by the army (43,000,000 rix-dollars were expended on the army in 1804,) and that the Archduke and Fasbender defeated every attempt at reduction of the expense; and secondly, the necessity, universally felt, of removing the worthless Duca,\* which could not be effected unless the Archduke’s power was first checked. The manner in which this whole plan was executed was uncourteous, and stupid in the extreme. The Archduke is still at the head of the department, but with limited power. He has great military talent on the field of battle, but he is entirely under the influence of bad men. Duca is now out of the way, and Mack is in his place. The Archduke was wholly under the influence of Duca, and the consequence was, that every thing was in disorder. If Napoleon had made an attack in February, we could not in six weeks have mustered 15,000 men to meet him! Mack is not a great man, as many suppose; but he has talent for organizing an army, and restless activity in making preparation. Where he now stands, he is our first man; but, Heaven forbid that he should rise a step higher! The Archduke neither loves him nor confides in him; but he is obliged to yield. Mack evidently has the sword in his own hand.”

Genz goes on to show that, in other respects, the Austrian ministry were no better prepared for a war which was now inevitable. He says, “The sun never shone on a more worthless ministry.” He employed all his influence to effect a cordial union and co-operation between Prussia, his native country, and Austria, but to no purpose. The leading ministers took measures more irritating than conciliatory; and a rooted grudge existed between the two governments, but for which Germany might have been saved. The series of letters which describe the scenes that followed are full of tragic interest; but this is not the place to enter upon the discussion of so extensive a subject.

The letters of von Genz occupy about half of the first volume; those of Böttiger occupy the remainder. The lat-

---

\* Respecting whom the following French pun was current in Vienna: ‘*L’empereur est bien pauvre, il n’a qu’un seul ducat, et celui est faux.*’



ter leads us, as might be expected, into an enchanted circle. First a director of a gymnasium, and a laborious philologist; then, under the influence of the geniuses which, at that time, adorned the court of Amalia at Weimar, gradually trained in general literature and criticism, till he became one of the most elegant, as well as prolific writers in the literary journals—the contributions to which, by his single pen, would make not less than fifty volumes;—finally, the most accomplished antiquarian of his time, and superintendent of the Royal Museum of Antiquities at Dresden, and the centre of the brilliant circle of scholars, critics and artists of that place, he could scarcely fail of giving us, in his correspondence, a delightful view of the literary activity of Germany in the various branches of learning which he cultivated. He was a contributor, and finally, the principal writer in Wieland's "*Mercury*," though not nominally editor. He edited the "*Journal of Fashions*," in which there were so many learned articles respecting the dress and customs of the ancients, (often translated and republished in Paris in Millin's "*Magazine*,") that Heyne once remarked, "Böttiger forces me to the sin of seizing upon his journal, as soon as I see it lying upon my wife's table." He wrote for Wieland's "*Attic Museum*," for the Jena, and afterwards the Halle, "*Literary Gazette*," edited by his friend Schütz, for "*Huber's Universal Gazette*," (for which he received 400 rix-dollars a year,) and many other journals of less notoriety, not less than thirty in all. Instead of being diverted by these labors from his main pursuits, he was conducted by them to the end he had in view; and the scattered rays of light, thrown into the leading journals of the times, were finally collected into one blaze, in his celebrated work entitled "*Sabina, or Morning Scenes at the Toilette of a Wealthy Roman Lady*." This work introduced that captivating method of treating Greek and Roman Antiquities, which Becker has carried to its highest perfection in his "*Gallus*," and "*Charicles*."

Böttiger's letters to Müller contain many interesting notices of the life, travels, and literary labors of von Hammer, Müller's disciple and "foster-son," as he is here playfully called. How much has that young and promising orientalist and historian accomplished, since those early travels and those first literary productions! With reference to the "*Xenien*," or satirical verses of Göthe and Schiller, published in the "*Al-*

manac of the Muses," against distinguished German authors and poets of the old school, Böttiger indignantly writes to his friend then residing in Vienna, "That monster, the new Almanac of the Muses, or of the Furies, as Nicolai calls it, is read, then, in Vienna, and despised there, as it is here, by all who have any sense of urbanity and propriety. Our best writers, instead of uniting in one phalanx against ignorance and barbarism, and mutually protecting and supporting each other, mercilessly lacerate each other, and present an agreeable farce to the frivolous and the ignorant. That such men as Göthe and Schiller should resort to clubs, when they have such a supply of polished shafts, is unpardonable."

Among other little incidents, Böttiger mentions that the *Adelphi* of Terence was exhibited in a metrical version, and in ancient costume at Weimar, 1801. It is well known that a similar occurrence in regard to one of the tragedies of Sophocles, in Berlin, under the direction of the gentlemen of the university, has recently given a new impulse to antiquarian researches relating to the Greek theatre. In another letter it is said, "Seume is here with the same coat and boots in which he made his pedestrian tour to Syracuse, a journey of 4500 miles!" These travels are among the most interesting productions of the kind, being equally distinguished for shrewdness of observation and elegance of composition.

In July, 1803, Böttiger writes, "I cannot, at present, think of any new undertaking, inasmuch as my place of residence is yet to be settled. Prospects are simultaneously opened before me in Berlin and Dresden. I would prefer to remain in little Weimar, if I could be freed from the necessity of writing for the journals, and could give my leisure hours wholly to my private studies." His office as Director of the Weimar gymnasium, though important in other respects, was not lucrative. The society in Weimar was, on the whole, agreeable to him, notwithstanding he came into occasional collision with Göthe, and even Herder, because he was too independent to praise every thing they did. He had, several years before, declined two invitations, one to the rectorship of the School-Pforta, where his salary would be twice as much as at Weimar, the other to Copenhagen, as superintendent of the Latin Schools of the kingdom, with a salary of 2500 rix-dollars. The Duke of Weimar, by kind expressions

rather than by pecuniary inducements, prevailed on him to remain. But now the places offered him were too favorable both to his studies and to his means of livelihood, to be resisted. Still he promised to remain, if he could be made superintendent of the Latin schools of the duchy with 1000 rix-dollars salary. This the Duke could not then promise. Wolf, Müller, and others, on the death of Gedike, superintendent of the schools in Berlin, interested themselves in securing the vacant place for Böttiger, and in Nov. 1803, the latter actually received a call to that honorable post, with a salary of 2000 rix-dollars. In the mean time Reinhard, Böttiger's most intimate friend, and others at Dresden were active in procuring a place for him in that city; and just as he was about to accept his appointment in Berlin, he received an invitation to take charge of a literary institution in Dresden, with an inferior salary, indeed, but with the advantage, invaluable to him, of a residence in the Florence of Germany. The duke Charles Augustus, of Weimar, said to him, as he met him at that time, "My dear Böttiger, I hear you are about to leave us." I sincerely regret it. But there are delicate relations subsisting here now, and under present circumstances, I cannot do what is necessary to retain you." He at the same time advised him, as a native Saxon, to give Dresden the preference to Berlin. The Prussian king consented, though reluctantly, to the final decision of Böttiger, influenced as it was by a love of country, and a still stronger love of art, for which Berlin offered few facilities.

In opening the second volume, we find two hundred and fifty pages occupied with the correspondence of Heyne, the most authentic source of information with reference to the University of Göttingen, and the public schools of Westphalia, during the temporary existence of that government. Heyne was at the head of the University, and Müller was the Minister of education. These letters, therefore, are, to the literary historian, so many pearls unexpectedly discovered. From this source, we learn some interesting facts in regard to the charitable institution of free tables. At Göttingen, a free table means a free seat *at dinner*. In 1808, there were 124 such, for the benefit of indigent students, mostly at the expense of the government; the remainder, about one third, are provided for by particular cities, or by legacies left for that purpose. At present, there are more than 200 such free seats,



besides an annual sum of about 3,500 rix-dollars, distributed to poor students at the different rates, of 25, 30, 35, 40 dollars to each, according to the class of the foundations to which the student belongs. But even this liberal provision falls far short of that at Leipsic. There, a free table includes both dinner and supper; and, in the majority of cases, is the same thing as a scholarship. Those scholarships which furnish the student with a certain annual sum of money, instead of a free table, vary from 10 to 200 rix-dollars; but 50 is the ordinary amount. As early as 1580, the Elector of Saxony founded 300 scholarships in the two Universities of Wittenburg and Leipsic, or 150 in each. These were in the form of free rooms and free tables. Since that time, individuals have, by legacies, established about one hundred foundations of different values, from the proceeds of which about 250 students are supported either entirely or in part. No wonder that Leipsic has for ages been the centre of the book-making world.

There are a few passages relating to the appointment of professors, and to the estimation in which different candidates were held, that may be welcome to our readers, not only as a curiosity, but as an illustration of university life in Germany. There were some vacant professorships to be filled at Göttingen. In the mean time, it was in contemplation to suspend the universities of Helmstadt and Rinteln. The appointing power lay with Müller and his associates; but Heyne best knew the wants of his own University, and the talents and characters of the various men under consideration, and had, moreover, been active in the appointment of every professor then in Göttingen. His opinion weighed more than that of any other man in the kingdom. Let us hear his comments upon the different characters concerned in these proposed changes. He observes,

“Henke, of Helmstadt, would be a valuable acquisition for Göttingen, if he would be disposed to accept of a professorship which is the third in rank. Wegscheider, of Rinteln, was once here, and I took much pains to make him succeed, but without effect. He failed in consequence of withdrawing from theology, for which we designed him, and of devoting himself to philosophy, for which he has no talent. He deserves to be esteemed for his personal character; but he will never be able to rise above mediocrity. Wachler, of Rinteln, is just the

opposite of Wegscheider; he has more talent than industry. In his lectures, he relies on superficial preparations, and figures with other men's learning. It would be a good thing to secure Meckel for Halle. Bredow is not needed in Göttingen. He is distinguished in history and geography, but is ignorant of the world, blunt in his manners, and just the man to be great in a small university. He is another Voss, attacking every thing that is not after his own style. Whether he is a diamond that can be polished or not, the ministry itself can best judge; if he can, Göttingen would be a good place for him; if he cannot, his presence here would be an injury to the manners of our students, and to our more quiet mode of life and refined scholarship. It would not be well to increase our corps of instructors suddenly by a large accession from the smaller universities. Such men have often had a bad influence upon us. They cannot easily lay aside the petty jealousies and contentions to which they have been accustomed. So it is with our excellent Eichhorn. He cannot live except in intrigue. Had the furious spirit of contention, which has come over the philosophers during the last ten years, been allowed to enter into our literary journal in Göttingen, what a sad influence would it have had upon the university, and upon German literature generally! Schlözer, I have won over; he is now quiet and friendly. Eichhorn, my antagonist, on account of his interfering with Heeren [Heyne's son-in-law], I have been able to hold in check. If Bredow were to be added to our uneasy spirits here, we should have more than we could manage. Sartorius is a man of good abilities, with a precious spice of vanity. Bouterwek has the minor faults often attendant on genius, and knows little of the world, but is otherwise a first rate man."

At a subsequent period, when the ministry were looking around for a suitable man to fill the vacancy above mentioned in the theological faculty, Heyne writes to Müller:

"Planck and myself lately sat down and went through all the Saxon and other universities, and could find no one, in all respects fit for the place. Henke would be the best, but he would hardly accept the appointment. Ammon, of Erlangen, would gladly return here as professor; but we were glad to get rid of him. His love of novelty, his affectation and vanity corrupted the tastes of our young men. Beck, of Leipsic, is a learned man, but he is a mere verbal critic and compiler. Schleusner did not succeed when he was here before, and was glad of an opportunity to leave. Eckerman, of Kiel, was educated here, and is a learned, but not a practical man. Paulus is merely an exegetical scholar, and is not needed here in addition to Eichhorn; besides, they would not work well together. Vogel, of Altdorf, would be the best man for us, if he could be had; but he has been invited to Landshut. Thus we have gone the rounds."

Surely this is a precious relic of grave and confidential *chit chat*, giving us, as it were, a stolen view of what was going on behind the curtain. It is to the honor of Heyne that he did not abuse the confidence reposed in him; that while he had the honesty to express all his personal convic-

tions, he also had the candor to acknowledge most fully the merits of those, who were certainly not his warm friends. The public now knows, from other sources of information, that Heyne was not mistaken in his estimate of character; and few possessed a better divination in regard to the intellectual capacities of young men, and the probabilities of their future eminence. The seeming injustice done to Bredow, arises from the fact, that the peculiar state of things at Göttingen made it necessary to dwell more upon his faults than upon his acknowledged excellencies. Bredow was an eminent scholar; but let any one read the published correspondence of Schütz, and of Passow, and he will be convinced that Heyne judged correctly of his personal character. Wachler rose to a higher eminence than would have been expected from Heyne's account of him. It was, however, in another department of learning, and in consequence of an impulse subsequently given to his industry. His abilities were never questioned. Wegscheider's subsequent eminence was altogether factitious, and has entirely passed away. His position, by the side of Gesenius, as the representative of rationalism in systematic theology, gave him a celebrity, which his talents in other circumstances never would have done. Eichhorn was no better than Heyne represents him as being; and his literary reputation has greatly fallen within one generation.

We have been particularly entertained with the letters of George Forster, the Argonaut, as his friends sometimes called him. He was the son of the celebrated Forster, the companion of Cook in his voyages round the world, and son-in-law of Heyne. When but seventeen years of age, he accompanied his father in these voyages; and, after various adventures, devoted his life to science and literature in Germany, and became one of the most elegant and popular German prose writers. By Heyne's and Müller's influence, he was made librarian to the Elector of Mayence. One of his early letters to Müller presents the character of both in such an interesting light, in respect to their religious feelings, that we cannot forbear to insert a part of it in this place. In this letter, which is without date, he says:

“Why should I not, my dear Müller, reply to that portion of your letter which has most deeply affected my heart, and convinced me of



the excellent state of your moral feelings? The diffidence, which you express in your own unaided powers, is a proof to me of your close self-inspection. I am, as you were informed a short time since, in a similar state of feeling, and still continue to learn, by daily experience, that no effort for that which is purely good, originates in myself. Consequently, I cannot for a moment indulge the hope of continuing, by any strength of my own, in a course of piety. But I do believe that perseverance is practicable through him who strengthens me,—through Jesus Christ. I believe that a spark of faith in God, kindled by him, and a spark of love to the All-perfect One, the primeval source of all strength and blessedness, is to us a glorious token of his grace, by which we may be assured that the doors which lead to him are open to us; and that he, out of his free and unmerited love, will approach to us. It is something to know that nothing finite can satisfy our spiritual nature. It is something to seek the gratification of the soul in a congenial element, in spiritual light, which alone can satisfy our wants. But it is a great thing to have advanced so far in faith as to feel an assurance that there is a revealed Mediator, through whom our spirits, now fettered in sense, can be brought back into union with the source from which they sprang; and that such confidence in Christ is itself an effect of the infinite mercy of God. Great as such a blessing is to those who know its value, it is not greater than the mystery of Providence in the choice of them, who, without any procuring act of their own, are made possessors of it. Here is reason enough for humility and abandonment of self, in order to follow entirely the voice of that grace which calls on us simply to trust and hope, and will itself work in us both to will and to do. But there is rooted in our nature more deeply than can be conceived, a selfishness which a sincere Christian, or, what is the same thing, a *true man*, must continually struggle to overcome. When we flatter ourselves that we have gained a victory, we often fall back into such temptations and have such conflicts as to be a wonder to ourselves; and at these times we should despair, were it not that, during the interval between such periods, our faith is strengthened, and we are actually brought nearer to God than before, so that we can renew our struggle with increased vigor.—In these times of conflict, friends are often employed by Providence, to revive the recollection of such principles, and to present them in a new and more convincing light. Every good man will readily accept that aid of a friend, or give it to him in turn when it is needed.”

When Mayence, in 1792, fell into the hands of the French, Forster, with a strong love of liberty, threw himself into the arms of the new republic. The consequence was, that, on the re-capture of that city, he was outlawed, and his property confiscated. He never saw his family but once afterwards; and that was when he met them privately on the frontiers, in the presence of Huber, his friend, to whom he committed them for protection. What other causes of separation may have existed are rather hinted at than explained. Enough. Forster died in Paris after a short time,

and Huber married the widow of his friend. It is under the name of Therese Huber, that this eldest daughter of Heyne, and the widow of Forster, is best known in literature. She at first merely assisted her husband in translating and preparing works for the press, unconscious of her own powers; but her talents as a writer were soon discovered by him, though the true authorship of many books published under his name, was kept a secret till after his death. Huber himself was a popular writer, and editor of one of the best literary journals then published, the one for which Böttiger was a standing contributor, with a compensation of 400 rix-dollars a year. There are a few letters in this collection from Therese Huber, then a widow for the second time. She writes to Müller with the most ardent affection, resulting partly from the kindness she had received, but still more from sympathy with the noble moral sentiments with which his writings abound. "My son," she says in one of her letters, "is growing up. When the earth covers this glowing heart of mine, will his also feel the ardor and energy of faith? This son is with a countryman of yours, whose name cannot be unknown to you,—I mean Fellenberg, of Hofwyl. He requested me to give him my Victor to be educated with his children and a few others; and if his noble plan succeeds, he will rear a race of men who can understand your writings—the present generation cannot. He thinks my boy promises to become such a man as he would wish to form. Fire, energy, unbounded affection without the least concealment—these are the qualities of Huber's son, now in his seventh year, strong and bounding as a roe of the forest." And who is this Victor A. Huber? He is now professor of history in Berlin University, author of the *History of the English Universities*, recently translated and published at Oxford, and apparently just such a man as his devoted and faithful mother wished him to be.

We have indulged so freely in remarks on a few topics which presented themselves at random, as we were looking over these fascinating letters, that we have no space left to speak of the mass of the correspondence, consisting of the letters of more than fifty distinguished men. Still, it is hoped that enough has been said to indicate the entertainment which may be expected by those who shall peruse these volumes for themselves.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

## I. BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

1. *The Prophecies of Daniel*. No. 1. Nebuchadnezzar's Dream of the Great Image. By GEORGE BUSH, Professor in the New York City University. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1844. pp. 72. 8vo.

*The Prophecies of Daniel and John*, illustrated by the Events of History. By ISAAC TAYLOR HINTON. St. Louis. Turnbull & Pray. Philadelphia. Am. Bap. Pub. Society.

The work of Prof. Bush is to be issued in ten or twelve numbers, at intervals of a few weeks. The first number, commencing with chapter 2 of the Prophecy, is, probably, a fair specimen of the work. Every verse is printed in the Hebrew or Chaldee, and in the Greek, Latin, and English versions, and followed by extended scholia. The work is sufficiently thorough as to its method, and will be useful, especially to the uninitiated, as an exhibition of the laborious process of interpretation. Whether the professor designs to offer any new views, we are not informed; the present number does not reach far enough to permit him to develop any theory concerning the difficult topics of which he treats. The known views of Prof. Bush, however, prompt us to expect at least a few suggestions out of the ordinary course. The work is a fine specimen of typographical beauty, and commends itself to the respectful regards of the student of prophecy. We are pleased with the common-sense views set forth in the Introduction, and take them as an earnest of sober criticism throughout the remainder of the work.

Mr. Hinton, in a concise Introduction of thirteen pages, divides all the prophecies into two classes; the discursive, or those which do not observe any precise order of time, and the chronological, or those in which the order of succession is generally maintained. The prophecies of the Scriptures, he remarks, are chiefly of the former class, with the exception of the writings of Daniel and John. Next follows a brief account of symbolical language with the mode of interpreting it, and considerations relating to the authenticity of Daniel. The Introduction closes by stating the author's plan, to group together the several visions of Daniel and the descriptions of John which refer to the same event under one head, expounding them all in connection. In his exposition, Mr. Hinton follows, in many respects, most of the former commentators. Unlike Prof. Chase (see Remarks on Daniel, p. 12 seq.), he maintains, with Bishop Newton, and the Christian fathers, that the fourth kingdom is the Roman dominion, confounding the reign of Alexander's successors with the reign of Alexander himself, and embracing the whole in the third kingdom. With Irenæus and others, he interprets the "number of the beast," (Rev. 13: 18) by the word *ΑΙΕΙΒΟΣ* (666).

In subsequent parts of the prophecies, especially of the Apocalypse, he designates the description of the Reformation and the scenes which



succeeded it, the French revolution, the exploits of Napoleon, and other events which have agitated the world, carrying the whole down to A. D. 1864. In particular verses of several of the chapters, he finds the prophecy of particular acts and achievements of Bonaparte. He regards the phrase "a thousand years," as general and indefinite. We apprehend that the interpretations of Mr. Hinton will not secure the approbation of the most judicious commentators. The light which has been thrown on the subject of exegesis generally, and on the Apocalypse in particular, by the labors of recent scholars, opens a new era in the history of prophetic exposition, of which interpreters will do well to avail themselves.

2. *Kommentar zum Evangelium Johannis, Sechste Auflage. Durchgängig neue Ausarbeitung.* Commentary on the Gospel of John. Sixth edition, entirely re-written. By Dr. THOLUCK. 1844.

The public opinion in Germany has never accorded to the Commentary of Prof. Tholuck on John, so high a rank as a critical work, as that which most of his other exegetical labors have attained. In its original form, it was one of his earliest productions, and was designed for the use of beginners in theological study, rather than for more practised and critical readers. Yet even with this estimation of its character, it has been received with great favor, and four editions of it,—a distinction which comparatively few German works can boast,—had been exhausted before its appearance in the re-modelled state in which it is here presented to us. The preface to the present edition explains the extent and general nature of the changes which have been introduced. The author there says: 'Since the publication of the fifth edition of this Commentary, our literature has been so much enriched with writings which relate to the interpretation of this gospel, that I have deemed it expedient, though partially altered already in the earlier editions, to re-write the work, in this instance, entirely anew. In the preparation of the sixth edition, the following more recent productions have been consulted, in addition to those previously employed: Neander, Life of Jesus, third edition; Strauss, Life of Jesus, fourth edition; Krabbe, Life of Jesus; the critical writings of Lüzelsberger, Schwegler, Br. Bauer; Lücke's Commentary, third edition; Ebrard, Scientific Critique of the evangelical history; Mau, on Death as the Penalty of Sin, and still others. The Commentary of Baumgarten-Crusius, and the Doctrinal Views of John, by Köstlein, I have not been able to use in the body of the work, but have given extracts from them in an appendix. Among the older commentators, whom other expositors have not used at all, or only here and there, I have had recourse throughout, more particularly to the following: Luther in his sermons, Bucer, Crell, Maldonat. Bengel also, I have consulted still more frequently. The work has received, consequently, a greater extension than in the preceding edition.' May it commend itself also to public favor in this renewed form, and promote the cause of sacred science! It is much to be regretted, that the works, in which Prof. Tholuck is chiefly known to the English world as an interpreter, are not his best productions; but in the case both of his Commentary on Romans, and that on the Gospel of John, are translations from first editions, which have been entirely superseded in Germany by the improvements which they have since undergone.

3. *Handbuch der Theologischen Literatur* von Dr. GEORG BENEDICT WINER, Professor an der Universität, Leipzig. *Erstes Ergänzungsheft zur dritten Auflage.* Manual of Theological Literature, by Dr. Winer, etc. First supplementary volume to the third edition. 1842.

The third edition of the general work here mentioned, greatly enlarged, as compared with the two preceding editions, was published in two volumes in 1836-40, bringing down the literature, however, of which it treats, only to the end of 1837. The Supplement now added, contains the most important new materials which have accumulated since that time till the end of 1841. It is a closely printed book of three hundred and fifty pages, and gives one a striking idea of the activity which distinguishes the Germans in the cultivation of biblical and theological studies. Some English, and a few American notices are inserted in the work, but it does not pretend to any thing like completeness in this respect. A register like this, which presents merely the title of the principal theological works and brief biographical notices of their authors, is a very convenient book; but it would have increased the value of it, especially for foreign students, had the plan of it embraced also some account of the character and merits of the works enumerated. In the preface to this supplement, Dr. Winer mentions an amusing instance of the difficulty which attends the attainment of entire accuracy in the collection of statistical information of this kind. Two of the writers, to whom he applied for some knowledge of their own personal history, blundered in reporting to him the year of their own birth! An additional supplement may be expected at the end of 1845.

## II. CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

4. *Grammar of the Greek Language for the use of High Schools and Colleges.* By Dr. RAPHAEL KÜHNER. Translated from the German by B. B. Edwards, Professor in the Theological Seminary, and S. H. Taylor, Principal of Phillips Academy, Andover. From the press of Allen, Morrill & Wardwell. Andover. 1844.

Kühner stands, unquestionably, at the head of living Greek grammarians. On this point, there exists but one opinion in Germany; and as proof of this, we need refer only to the enthusiastic favor, with which his various works have been received by his countrymen, and the rapid manner in which they are there coming into general use. Some of the points, in which we regard the grammar which the gentlemen at Andover have here given to us in English, as specially distinguished, are the manner in which it traces the changes of words in their inflexion to the natural laws which regulate the development of language, the fulness and accuracy with which it unfolds the nature and force of the Greek particles, and above all, the method, copiousness, precision of view and representation which mark the syntactical portions. The translators have executed their task with eminent skill and fidelity, and in placing this work within the reach of our teachers and students, have rendered a service to the cause of Greek learning among us, which, we would fain hope, will not be without an effect in its promotion. In this result, no class of men have reason to feel a deeper interest than theological teachers; and it is with special propriety that a part of the labor in this instance has proceeded from such a teacher. The exegetical study of the New Testament in our theological seminaries can never afford to students

its full advantages, unless the knowledge of the Greek language which it presupposes on their part, be in some good measure really possessed by them. On account of its bearing in manifold ways on the study of the original Scriptures, we cannot but be gratified to see our facilities for acquiring a better knowledge of Greek increasing so rapidly, and a growing conviction diffusing itself of the utility of philological pursuits in general.

We would respectfully call the attention of the translators to a somewhat extended notice of the original German work, in a late number of the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* (May, 1844), written by Professor Poppo. He is well known as the editor of Thucydides, and portions of Xenophon, and as one of the ablest Greek scholars in Germany. The strongly eulogistic terms in which he there speaks of the grammar, constitute a decisive testimony to its excellence, and may be taken as expressing the decision of the critical public generally in respect to its merits. At the same time, he specifies a few points in which he deems it capable of improvement, and in particular, suggests a change in the arrangement of some of the materials, by which he conceives its practical utility might be promoted. Such notices, which are very common in the German periodicals, are not regarded as implying any disparagement of an author; on the contrary, the ablest writers rely on them as important means for enabling them to bring the subsequent editions of their works to a more perfect state.

5. *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneidos Libri. Edidit et annotatione illustravit P. HOFFMAN PEERLKAMP. 1843.*

The appearance of a new edition of the *Aeneid* from Peerlkamp will mark a new era in Virgilian literature—in the language of the poet himself,

‘Magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.’

He is considered by universal consent, one of the finest classical scholars in Europe, and every thing which he produces is received by the learned public with the greatest interest. He is a native of Holland; was born in 1786, and is at the present time Professor of History in the university at Leyden. His most important previous productions are an edition of Xenophon of Ephesus, and the *Agricola* of Tacitus, in the earlier part of his career, and more recently, an edition of Horace, which is regarded as belonging to the most distinguished philological products of the age. He is often bold in his critical conjectures, and has put forth, at various times, opinions in his writings, which have been a subject of much contention among scholars, and which are still far from having made their way to universal acquiescence. But it is acknowledged, even in these cases, that no man can support his views with greater critical acumen, or fairer show of reason and learning, and no one has a better right than he to demand a careful consideration of whatever he may be pleased to propose. If any one would see to what a degree of precision a man's knowledge of the Latin language may be brought, what an illimitable field for the exercise of the judgment, the memory, the taste, and every other higher faculty of the mind, philology, when properly pursued, opens to those who devote themselves to it, if he would bring himself to a consciousness of the much which may be known, and the little which he himself knows, though he may have begun to turn gray in these studies, let him look into these notes of Peerlkamp. They are in Latin, and within every scholar's



reach. The ordinary archæological and historical explanations, which make up the staple of so much commentary on the classics, are here almost wholly wanting; and the editor's labor is expended chiefly on the text, and the linguistic illustration of the author. It is a work, obviously for teachers and not for beginners.—The great poet, it is but just to add, has fallen, in this instance, into the hands of the best of printers, as well as of editors. Nothing can exceed the neatness and elegance with which the typographical portion of the book is executed.

6. *The Metres of the Greeks and Romans.* A Manual for schools and private study. Translated from the German of Edward Munk. By CHARLES BECK and C. C. FELTON, Professors in Harvard University. 1844.

We are glad to see the attention of scholars called, in so authoritative a manner as is done by the appearance of the present volume, to a much neglected branch of classical learning. The meagre account of Greek and Latin prosody given at the end of the grammars in ordinary use, is entirely inadequate to the wants of students; and yet even this, we suspect, is more than the generality of them have been accustomed fully to master. The publication of this treatise will accomplish, therefore, a two-fold object. It will serve to bring the subject here treated of into more prominent notice in our courses of liberal study, and at the same time, furnish the means for acquiring that information respecting it, which this awakened consciousness of its claims will lead scholars to desire. The subject of the Greek and Roman Metres, when pursued into all its details and intricacies, is one of endless extent and labor, and might furnish a person with occupation for a lifetime; but no one who devotes himself with any zeal to classical pursuits, will consent, with such a facility as this within reach, to be wholly unskilled in these mysteries, or can in fact remain ignorant of them without forfeiting all just pretensions to elegant scholarship. For the judiciousness of the selection, in presenting to the public this treatise of Munk, for the accuracy with which it has been translated, and the skill with which it has been adapted to the wants of the student, we may rely with confidence on the ability of the gentlemen to whom we are indebted for its appearance.

7. *The Principles of Latin Grammar*; comprising the substance of the most approved Latin Grammars extant. By Rev. PETER BULLIONS, D.D. New York: Pratt, Woodford & Co. 1844. pp. 303. 12mo.

*The Principles of Greek Grammar*; comprising the substance of the most approved Grammars extant. By the same. Third Edition. pp. 312. 12mo.

The Grammars of Dr. Bullions have been for a considerable time before the public. The English Grammar—whose title we have omitted, but which has much excellence—has reached the fifth edition; and the Greek, the third. They are abundantly recommended in the State of New York, where they have been tested by use more than any where else. The author, in his title-page, modestly proposes to give no more than a compilation from the most approved grammars extant. Moore's Grammar is the basis of the Greek, and Adam, of the Latin. Additions and improvements, however, are adopted without scruple from other sources. The design of Dr. B. was to construct a series of

grammars, in which "the principles, so far as they are the same, should be arranged in the same order, and expressed, as nearly as possible, in the same terms." This is done, that the study of one language may aid in the study of another, and that the opportunity of seeing wherein they agree, and wherein they differ, may facilitate the study of comparative or general grammar. In the plan, arrangement and execution of each of the three volumes, we see much to be commended. They are all adapted to learners in the elementary stages of education. For advanced scholars, particularly in the ancient languages, some higher treatises, such as have been given us by the learning and research of the German scholars, are indispensable. Some pages, however, both in the Greek and Latin grammars, show that the author was not unmindful of the wants of the more advanced pupils of schools and colleges. He advocates a pronunciation of the Latin, which, however much can be said in its favor, still grates harshly on an unaccustomed ear; e. g. the long *e* in the infinitive of the second conjugation, he sounds like *a* in *hate*, as, *docere*; the long *i*, as in *linum*, like *i* in *machine*; the diphthongs *œ* and *æ*, like *ey* in *they*; and *au*, as in *aurum*, like the German *au*, i. e. like *ou* in *our*. In the Greek, he prefers the Erasmian pronunciation, which prevails in Europe. In this, the vowels generally take the sounds of the vowels in the continental languages, *v* falling into the French *u*. The *χ* is sounded like the German *ch* in *buch*. In the formation of the tenses of the Greek verb, he rejects the method of the common school grammars entirely, after the example of Thiersch and other grammarians, and substitutes another which he regards as more simple. This is to form every tense immediately from the root by annexing the proper tense-ending, and prefixing the augment to the tenses that require it. This mode is, perhaps, the more philosophical, and may be the more easy to one who has been initiated into it from the beginning. But when we take into view the first, second and third roots which it is necessary to feign or form, in the case of many verbs, and the apparatus of rules and exceptions belonging to these formations, we confess that the new method seems to us to have little advantage, on the score of simplicity, over the old. On the whole, the grammars are excellent treatises; and, in the hands of a judicious instructor, they will lay a foundation in many a youth, for the successful pursuit of liberal studies. If education in general, and especially classical education, should keep pace with the number of elementary books which issue from the press, the next age will see a race of excellent scholars and elegant men. In the department of Greek grammar, particularly, we are surprised and gratified by the zeal, which brings out some new treatise almost every month.

### III. GENERAL LITERATURE.

8. *Connection of Sacred and Profane History.* Being a Review of the Principal Events in the World, as they bear upon the State of Religion, from the close of the Old Testament History till the establishment of Christianity. By D. DAVIDSON. In three volumes. 12mo. New York. Robert Carter. 1844.

No reading is more interesting or profitable than history. There are two ways of reading history. It may be read simply as history; or it may be read with reference to the government of God. He who seeks in history an illustration of the methods of divine Providence, is bene-

fited in a spiritual respect by his reading, at the same time that his acquisitions of knowledge are increased. It is a good work to encourage the young, especially, in their historical reading, to trace the hand, and to interpret the designs of God, in the successive events which are recorded in the histories of various nations and in the narratives of various events. For such a purpose, the works of Prideaux, Shuckford, and the present work of Davidson, are eminently adapted. Without much claim to originality, this book details largely the historical events, and then shows how the hand of God appeared in them. An extensive and minute index is furnished for the purpose of reference. It is a valuable contribution to theological and general literature. The eminent publisher has shown his judgment, piety and taste in issuing the reprint of such a work; and the public will be grateful that so much interesting information can be obtained for the low price of \$1.50.

9. *Travels in South-Eastern Asia*: Embracing Hindustan, Malaya, Siam and China; with Notices of numerous Missionary Stations, and a full account of the Burman Empire; with dissertations, tables, etc. By HOWARD MALCOM. Seventh Edition. Two vols. in one. Boston. Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. 1844.

The journal of Mr. Malcom, as a deputation of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions to their Stations in the East, has already been before the public for several years. It is one of the most interesting collections of travels that have issued from the press in this country, and will compare well with the journal of Messrs. Tyerman and Bennet, who were sent on a similar errand, some years earlier, by the London Missionary Society. It communicates many useful items of information concerning the every-day life of missionaries in heathen countries, for which, in authors generally, we look in vain. It is especially to be valued, as furnishing an answer to the objections of those who are the enemies of missions, because, as they imagine, the work is carried on far away from home, and beyond the possibility of the minute inspection of the friends and supporters of the enterprise. The fact that the work has already reached the seventh edition is a gratifying proof of the estimate which has been put upon it. With all the illustrative engravings, it is sold, in one handsome volume, on good paper, beautifully printed and bound, at the low price of \$1.50. The publishers have done essential service to the missionary cause, by meeting the increased interest which now prevails, not only with this fine volume, but also with new and cheap editions of the *Memoirs of Mrs. Judson*, and of *George D. Boardman*. Such volumes are far better as gift-books, in token of respect and affection, than the more imposing, but often trashy annuals.

10. *The Conservative Principle in our Literature*. An Address before the Literary Societies of the Hamilton Literary and Theological Institution. By WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS. Second Edition. New York. Lewis Colby. 1844. pp. 135. 16mo.

For this most interesting and valuable address we wish a wide circulation. It is a production of great worth, full of rare and curious information, and sanctified by truth and piety. The contributions to the literature of the "*Dies Iræ*," in the notes, possess much interest, and to most English readers they will be chiefly new. The little book is eminently worthy of the fame of the author. It was originally published as an 8vo. pamphlet. In its present beautiful form, it is still



more acceptable, and less likely to be laid aside and forgotten. As one of the first offerings of a new publishing house, we regard it as a valuable earnest of the character of the works, which are hereafter to be furnished to the public by an esteemed friend and brother.

11. *History of the Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Period of the Disruption in 1843.* By W. M. HETH-  
ERINGTON. First American from the Third Edinburgh Edition. New  
York. Robert Carter. 1844. pp. 500. 8vo.

This is a valuable work on a most interesting topic, and with a good index. Every one has been interested, from his youth, in the character and fortunes of the Scottish covenanters, although many have a very indistinct notion of them, except as affording a record of romantic adventure, and Christian faithfulness under severe persecution. Were it in our power, we should delight to give an epitome of the history, so exciting and attractive in itself, and so appropriate in our times. But such a work is not easily condensed into very narrow limits. It will be a standard work on the subject of which it treats, and, we hope, fully remunerate the expense of its publication in this country.

12. *English Martyrs.* Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, and other English Martyrs. By CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH. Selected from English Martyrology, for the use of Sabbath Schools. New York. John S. Taylor and Co. 1844. pp. 300. 12mo.

*The Spirit of Popery.* An Exposure of its Origin, Character and Results, in Letters from a Father to his Children. American Tract Society. New York. pp. 378. 24mo. 1844.

These volumes are eminently adapted to the times and the country in which we live. The Church of Rome, in all ages, a persecuting power, though some of its characteristics may, through policy, be concealed, in order to secure its authority in countries and under governments and institutions, which would instantly take the alarm and rise up to resist its encroachments, if its true spirit were openly displayed. As an ecclesiastical organization, it claims to be infallible, and, of course, must be unchangeable. Such as it has been in France, Spain, Ireland and England, such it will still be, so far as it is not repressed, in all these countries again, and in America, Burmah, Siam, China, and the South Sea Islands. Circumstances may force it, in part, to cover its true nature and treasonable designs, and to remit its cruelties for a season. But it has a spirit which will lead it to declare itself, as fast and as far as a prudent regard to its own aggrandizement will permit. The events which have transpired in this country within the last two or three years, are calculated to put a free Christian people on their guard. And among the most valuable means of awakening the community to their true danger are such books as we have named at the head of this notice. The first shows what Popery has been, as a bitter, persecuting agent, a cruel, uncompromising enemy of pure religion. The second shows what it has been and still is,—a system of formalism, corruption, and folly; uncharitable, severe, and vengeful against all other sects. The book entitled, "English Martyrs," describes, in an interesting manner, the lives, labors, and sufferings of those men of God who sealed their testimony with their blood. It is written in a clear, attractive style, and has an excellent preface by Bickersteth. Two thirds of the volume are occupied by a minute account of Ridley, Latimer, Cranmer, and Brad-

ford, of blessed memory, and the remaining third, in a description of the life, trials and death of ten others, whose names are less familiar. We are glad to notice, in this connection, that an edition of Fox's Martyrology has also been published recently, at the extremely low price of one dollar. The books of this class will open the eyes of the people more effectually to the true character and spirit of Romanism, than volumes of discussion concerning the theological opinions of the Papal school. The work above quoted, entitled, "The Spirit of Popery," describes in the form of letters, many of the follies and corruptions of Romanism. The narrations are given with the vivacity of an eye-witness. The account of Popery, as it is, is fitted to impart to every reader, old or young, an accurate idea of the vanity of the pretensions of such a scheme to the character of a system of faith, revealed from God, and designed for the suffering and the guilty. Twelve fine engravings illustrate the scenes described, and the mechanical charms of the book, added to its other intrinsic excellences, entitle it, at this day, to a wide circulation.

13. *The Works of Charlotte Elizabeth.* With an Introduction by Mrs. H. B. STOWE. Vol. I. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1844. pp. 502.

This elegant octavo volume is the first of a series, designed to comprise the complete works of Mrs. Tonna. The publisher announces that one or more volumes will speedily follow, and others as soon as the materials are afforded to compose them. The present issue contains the "Personal Recollections," regarded by many as the best of the author's productions, besides the interesting "Letters from Ireland," "Miscellaneous Poems," "Osric," a Missionary tale in verse, and two other pieces. The volume is adorned by a portrait of Charlotte Elizabeth, now first given to the American public. The author is so well known that it is needless for us to speak particularly in this place in praise of her performances. We have done it already in a former number. The enterprise of the publisher must involve much expense. We hope he will find an adequate remuneration. Since the first part of this notice was written, the second volume has appeared, uniformly with the first.

14. *Question Book of Scripture History:* for Sabbath Schools and Family Instruction. By HENRY J. RIPLEY, Professor in the Newton Theological Institution. New England S. S. Union. Boston. pp. 72. 24mo. 1844.

Any book is welcome, whose object is to improve our educational apparatus. We have reason to fear that the Sabbath school systems have erred, especially in the few past years, by employing the pupils in studies and occupations too high for them. In many cases, question books have been wholly laid aside; and young children have been expected to understand the inquiries and investigations belonging to every verse, to apprehend the difficulties and to seek out the solution of them, without any guide, as a student in divinity would do. In others, the books used have been either on topics too elevated, or on those which have not sufficient interest to win the attention. Neither the Bible in course, nor full discussions of any doctrine are calculated to interest young scholars. Brief and striking narrative, obvious facts, and frequent transitions from one theme to another are best adapted to their habits of mind, and the early stages of their development. The ques-

tion-book of Prof. Ripley embraces twenty sketches from the Old Testament, and sixteen from the New, including suggestions for the use both of the instructor and the pupil. It is well suited to fill up a chasm in our series of books for Sabbath Schools.

15. *Recognition of Friends in Heaven.* A Discourse by DANIEL SHARP. Published by request. Boston. 1844. 24 pp. 8vo.

This discourse is an argument on the subject designated in the title. The argument is well conducted and satisfactory, and the style, clear and simple. It is founded on 1 Cor. 13: 12, "Now I know in part, etc." The points of the argument are, 1. It is reasonable to suppose that the righteous know each other in a future state. 2. That they do so may be inferred from the capacity which angels possess of distinguishing between different individuals on earth. 3. From the account which is given of the transfiguration of our Saviour. 4. From the expectations of inspired men. 5. From the fact that it is plainly intimated that they will even know the souls that are lost. The discussion is followed by several applicatory remarks in an earnest, serious manner. The whole is adapted to console the afflicted under their bereavements, with the hope of re-union with their departed friends in heaven.

16. *The Mourner's Chaplet; An Offering of Sympathy for Bereaved Friends.* Selected from American Poets by JOHN KEESE. Boston. Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. pp. 128. 32mo. 1844.

A beautiful little volume, prepared with exquisite taste, both in respect to its literary and mechanical execution.

*The Family Circle; Its Affections and Pleasures.* Edited by H. A. GRAVES. Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. Boston.

*The Family Altar; or the Duty, Benefits, and Mode of conducting Family Worship.* With remarks on the various parts of Prayer.

These little volumes belong to the beautiful miniature series, which have already had so wide a circulation. The first is composed of judicious selections, partly in prose, and partly in poetry. The second is chiefly a prose compilation, from authors who have written on the interesting and important theme of Family Worship. The first has more vivacity, and wins its way to the heart. The second appeals not to the affections only, but to the reason and the judgment. They are both marked by a cheerful religious tone, and are worthy of general attention, and careful reading. As a cheap and beautiful present, these and the other volumes of the series cannot be excelled.

17. *The Apostolical and Primitive Church, popular in its government, and simple in its worship.* By LYMAN COLEMAN, with an Introductory Essay by DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Second Edition. Boston. Gould, Kendall and Lincoln. 1844.

That two editions of this work should be called for in America within six months, and two reprints of it in England, is sufficient evidence of its having supplied a deficiency in our ecclesiastical literature. Whatever are the merits of Bingham in other respects, the chief Episcopal authority on the Antiquities of the Church, it has long been well known that he is radically defective in one essential point,—the difference between the practices of the earliest Church and that of the fourth and



fifth centuries. Mr. Coleman would have done a valuable service, had he merely corrected this fundamental error. But he has done more. He has given the whole subject a close examination, and prepared a work, under the most favorable circumstances, in which are incorporated, in a systematic form, the scattered materials to be found in the various writings of modern critics, and thus furnished the Christian public with a manual, both convenient and complete, on the subjects embraced in his plan. We consider it equally fortunate both for the author and for his readers, that the book made its appearance just at the time when it was most needed. This could not have been foreseen by Mr. Coleman, when he determined to enter upon the preparation; and the whole character of the execution goes to show that this is not, like too many of our popular books, a hurried production, owing its existence to the state of the market.

18. *What is Baptism?* An Essay; being chiefly a Review of a work by the Rev. EDWIN HALL. By Transmontanus. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Boston.

*Scripture Guide to Baptism.* By R. PENGILLY. From the ninth London Edition. Philadelphia. Am. Bap. Publication Society.

*A History of Baptism*, both from the Inspired and Uninspired Writings. By ISAAC TAYLOR HINTON. Philadelphia. Am. Bap. Publication Society.

*Terms of Sacramental Communion.* By ROBERT B. C. HOWELL. Philadelphia. Am. Bap. Publication Society.

No. 1 of these volumes is a dissertation on the mode of baptism. It is divided into three parts; the argument from the classic usage of the Greek word describing the ordinance, the argument from the Scriptures, and the argument from both combined. The philological part presents a good exhibition of the usage of the word, and the reasoning is generally fair. It is a compilation from other writers on the subject, rather than a fruit of the investigation of original sources. Hence, we have no new light on the topic discussed. The work, as its title indicates, is controversial in its character, and occasionally it is chargeable with being uncourteous in its tone.

No. 2 has long been known, both in this country and in England. It is from the ninth London edition, and treats both of the mode and subjects of baptism. It is, mainly, an examination of all the passages in the New Testament, which relate to the ordinance of baptism, with expository remarks on each by the author, and selections, confirmatory of the same views, from noted divines, who, in theory, espouse the other side of the question. It is written in an excellent and candid spirit, and is very suitable to be put into the hands of an inquirer.

No. 3 is an excellent work, embracing both a complete view of the argument, and a brief statement of the testimony of history. It is a valuable publication, and deserves to be better known.

No. 4 is an able exhibition of the principles of the Baptists on the terms of communion, and a judicious refutation of the charges of unreasonableness and exclusiveness. In issuing such works as these, the Publication Society is doing a good service to the cause of truth.

19. *The Book that will suit you*, or a word for every one. By Rev. JAMES SMITH. New York. M. W. Dodd. pp. 349. 24mo.

"This book is intended to lay [lie] on the table in the drawing-room, parlor, hall, kitchen or cottage; that the visiter who is waiting for an

interview, or the servant who is waiting for a message, or the neighbor who comes in to sit down for a few minutes, may take it up and read a portion, hoping that the Holy Spirit will make it a blessing. It is also suitable as a present to a relative, friend, servant or neighbor; and contains remarks adapted to every class of character, and suitable to almost every circumstance in life. The remarks are plain and pointed, and conveyed in language, the meaning of which cannot be mistaken."

The above extract from the preface, sufficiently exhibits the character and design of this little book. It contains a series of about 100 pieces, very prettily printed, and on almost every topic, on which a Christian would be likely, as a Christian, to speak to any one of his fellow-men. Its exhortations are serious and earnest, sometimes affecting. The verses with which several of the chapters are closed are not, in every case, of the highest order.

20. *Scripture History*, or Contemplations on the Historical Passages of the Old and New Testaments. By the Right Rev. JOSEPH HALL, Bishop of Norwich. Am. Tract Society. New York. 1844.

The Rev. Joseph Hall was born A. D. 1574, and died A. D. 1656, in the 82d year of his age. At the distance of two centuries from the period in which he flourished, his name and character are remembered with veneration. Sir Henry Wotton denominated him the Christian Seneca; and another has described him as the Chrysostom of England. The present volume, which contains 103 contemplations on interesting and striking passages of the Old and New Testaments, fully vindicates his claim to such praise. It will prove a valuable help to those who need assistance in meditating on the word of God. The Directors of the Tract Society merit the gratitude of the community for the republication of such treasures of ancient practical divinity.

21. *Miscellanies*, consisting principally of Sermons and Essays. By Rev. JOHN HARRIS, D. D. With an Introduction and Notes, By JOSEPH BELCHER, D. D. Boston. Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 287 pp.

The author of this volume has already accumulated a capital of fame in this country as a writer. To those who know him only through his works, the Introduction of Dr. Belcher, giving a sketch of his personal history, will be welcome. We gather from it that he is now but forty years of age, although he bears thick upon him the honors of successful authorship. The present volume contains eight sermons, and twelve other productions, chiefly written for a periodical in London. The latter "were published anonymously, but excited universal admiration." The sermons are all occasional sermons, and likely, therefore, to be among the author's best efforts. The whole volume is written in Dr. Harris' peculiar style, often rich and striking, sometimes pungent and forcible, always chaste and neat. It contains much of a missionary character, and, we trust, will be another instrument of promoting, by the blessing of God, the more speedy conversion of the world.

22. *The World's Religion, as contrasted with genuine Christianity*. By LADY COLQUHOUN. New York. John S. Taylor & Co. 1844.

This is a truly serious manual, designed to point out the way of salvation, to show the distinction between religion and irreligion in their practical exhibitions, and to enforce upon the professors of piety a visibly Christian life. We are pleased with its pious, earnest tone, its plain instructions, and its solemn appeals. They are timely, and will secretly do good.

## ARTICLE IX.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## AMERICA.

The Life of Leibnitz, by Mr. John M. Mackie on the basis of the German work of Guhrauer, is in press, and will soon be published by Gould, Kendall & Lincoln.—The same firm have in preparation an edition of Cruden's Concordance, abridged by omitting the definitions of terms, and a few unimportant words with their references. The changes will not injure the Concordance as a book of reference, while they will enable the publishers to sell the work at one third its former price.

*Library of Brown University.*—From the recent Circular of the Library Committee, drawn up by Prof. Gammell, we learn that the whole number of volumes now in the Library is 12,724, exclusive of pamphlets. Through the munificence of a gentleman in Providence, the foundation of a French collection has been laid, of a most valuable character. This collection embraces in all 1412 vols—89 folios, 88 quartos, 735 octavos, 480 smaller volumes, and 20 maps; and includes, among other important works, Petitot's and Guizot's collections for the History of France, contained in about 200 volumes—Transactions of the National Institute of Paris, in 40 volumes—the *Moniteur Universel*, in 77 volumes,—and that magnificent work, entitled, “The Description of Egypt,” published by the government of France during the reign of Napoleon, and embodying all the known facts illustrative of the history, scenery, government and manners of the Egyptians.”

## FRANCE.

*Discussion in respect to the Union of Church and State.*—In the year 1842, Prof. A. Vinet, of Lausanne, published a volume on this subject, written with great ability and eloquence. It is entitled, “*Essai sur la Manifestation des Convictions Religieuses et sur la Separation de l'Eglise de l'Etat*.” In replying to objections, Vinet referred to the experiment made in this country as evidence that a church could exist and prosper without the care of the government. Prof. Munier, of Geneva, in an address before the Consistory, maintained the opposite view; and held up the state of the American churches as a warning against the doctrine of Vinet. During the recent political excitement, the subject has been variously discussed. The Essay of Vinet has not been limited to France in its circulation. It has been translated into German by Dr. Volkmann, where the way had been prepared for the currency of such doctrines by the two works of Rittig and Wolff on the same subject.

In 1843, a new impulse was given to the discussion, by the appearance of Counsellor Agénor de Gasparin's book, entitled, “*Intérêts Généraux du Protestantisme Français*, Paris,” in which the sentiments of Vinet are maintained with great force and decision. This work, also, has been translated into German. At present, therefore, the great question of religious liberty is agitated in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Denmark, as it never has been before.

## GERMANY.

Among the most important and valuable works which have appeared in Germany the current year, may be reckoned the following; the 10th volume of Neander's Church History; the 2d and last volume of Reuchlin's History of Port-Royal; the 3d volume of Henry's Life of Calvin; the 7th volume of Ritter's History of Philosophy, or the 3d of Christian Philosophy; the 3d and last volume of K. Hagen's Literary and Religious Relations of Germany in the Age of the Reformation; H. W. Bensen's History of the Peasants' War in Franconia; the 4th volume of Schlosser's History of the Eighteenth Century; the 2d volume of Brandis' History of Greek and Roman Philosophy (Socrates and Plato); the 1st volume of Lassen's Antiquities of India (1843); the 2d volume of Hug's Examination of Strauss' Life of Jesus; a new edition of K. O. Müller's History of the Hellenic Tribes and Cities, corrected and enlarged from the author's posthumous papers, by Schneidewin, vols. 1—4.



Dr. Michelet, of Berlin, has published a volume on the latest stadium of German philosophy, with special reference to the present conflict between Schelling and the Hegelian school. It consists of lectures delivered in the university in the summer of 1842.

*Philological Gleanings.*—Demosthenis Orationes Philippicæ novem, by F. Franke, Leipzig. The reviewers describe this as a work of high order. The text is critically prepared; the notes are in Latin, and evincive of uncommon philological tact and scholarship.

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Oratore libri tres, by F. Ellendt. This consists of two volumes; gives a recension of the text, copious various readings, and the usual accompaniment of explanatory notes. It is the third important edition of this portion of Cicero's writings within the last ten years; and, with great excellences which the critics freely accord to it, possesses defects enough to keep it still in the category of imperfect things.

De Aeschinis oratoris vita, by Ewald Stechow, of Berlin. The writer is charged with having too strong a love for his subject. He has produced a beautiful panegyric, but a poor biography. Aeschines is constantly praised at the expense of Demosthenes.

Bilharz published in 1842, a tract on the question, Is Plato's theology deism? Stallbaum, the well known editor of Plato's works, has reviewed it, and disposes of it by pronouncing it unsatisfactory and worthless. This seals its fate. Nothing can ever redeem it from the sentence of such a judge. Towards Hartmann's de diis Timæi Platonici, on the contrary, he shows himself very favorable.

The Bibliotheca Graeca, by Jacobs and Rost, is still in rapid progress. Several new volumes appeared during the last year, and new editions of some of the previous ones have been issued. Greek studies in general, according to Bernhardt, in a late number of Prutz's Taschenbuch, which has occasioned no little commotion among the Latinists, is taking the head decidedly of Roman literature, and what is more, deserves, as he contends, this preference. There was a period in Germany when the Latin was the favorite study, and Greek was decried.

Dr. Seyffert, of the gymnasium at Brandenburg, has published a school-edition of the Memorabilia of Xenophon. It is described as exceedingly well adapted to the purpose. The notes are in Latin. It gives special attention to the idioms of the Greek, and of Xenophon in particular, and to a comparison of the genius of the Latin and Greek languages with each other. A second volume is proposed, consisting of selections from Lucian, which will be prepared on the same general plan.

C. Plinii Cæciliæ Secundi Epistolæ, with a critically corrected text and explanatory notes by Moritz Döring, Conrector of the Gymnasium at Freyberg, in two volumes, 1844. We have received this work, and hope ere long to notice it in a more formal manner. It is elegantly printed, with an introduction relating to the life and writings of Pliny, and a body of notes, not very copious, but discriminating, and adequate for all ordinary purposes of explanation. The age to which Pliny belonged, the scenes with which he was conversant, and the part which it fell to him to bear in the sufferings of some of the first Christian martyrs, give him special claims to our attention. We are glad to see that some of our colleges have introduced this author into their course of Latin study.

Winer has just published the fifth edition of his grammar of the Idioms of the New Testament, which purports to contain important improvements on the preceding editions.

A royal cabinet order has just appeared at Berlin, instituting a quinquennial prize of 1000 thalers, to be conferred on the author of the best historical work in the German language on any subject of German history, and vesting the decision in nine members of the Berlin Academy of Sciences. This royal foundation is stated to be in commemoration of the one thousandth anniversary of the treaty of Verdun.

The subject of international copy-right between England and Prussia is, at present, actively canvassed, and engages a considerable share of the attention of the Prussian government and the British embassy at Berlin.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

Professor Foggi, of the University of Pisa, is preparing for publication in Italian, an important work on the poetry of the Bible, on which he has been engaged for several years. It is described as presenting a complete development of the metrical system of Hebrew Poetry, as well as of the poetical nomenclature used by the ancient rhetoricians of the people of Israel.

Lamartine has concluded a contract with a Parisian publisher, by which he has disposed of the copy-right of his works for the sum of 450,000 francs. Among them are eight volumes hitherto unpublished, consisting of the "History of the Girondists," and the tragedy of "Toussaint l'Ouverture."

The ratio of persons receiving primary education in the various departments of France differs very much. In Morbihan, a part of Brittany, in the extreme West, where the people are semi-savage, the country wild, and the climate <sup>144</sup> number is 14,032, out of 449,743, or one in 32. On the opposite side of the kingdom, in the department of the Rhine, the number is 88,347, out of 561,859, or about one in 6. Education is, on the whole, improving; but the number of mixed schools, that is, schools composed of the children of Catholics and Protestants without regard to religious differences, is diminishing. In 1840, there were 28,018 Catholic schools, 677 Protestant, 31 Jewish, and 2,059 mixed. It is said that the Bible is not necessarily excluded from Catholic schools. In 1840, there were 62,359 teachers of primary education, embracing 38,338 lay masters, and over 20,000 lay female teachers. There were 76 training schools for males. The time of residence at these schools is two years. The discipline is very strict. The course of study embraces sacred history, French history, geography, particularly the geography of France, writing, French grammar and the rudiments of Latin, geometry, music, and latterly, some elements of agriculture and horticulture; also, so much legal knowledge as will enable the village master to assist the mayor in drawing up the legal documents necessary in his office. The entire number of pupils in the normal schools is about 3,000. The expense of board and lodging is about 250 francs a year. The expense falls on the parents, communes, and the departments of the State.

There are in France, 1,466 institutions of the higher grade, viz: 41 Royal Colleges with 15,780 pupils; 312 Academies with 28,200 pupils; 100 High Schools with 10,371 pupils; and 10,011 Boarding Schools with 24,580 pupils. Besides these, there are about 38,000 Primary Schools with 2,800,000 pupils, making in all nearly 40,000 schools of various grades, and about 3,000,000 scholars. Of these there are belonging to the Catholic persuasion 26,470 schools, 565 Protestant, 29 Jewish, and 2,450 belonging to no particular sect.

It has been estimated that at Rome there is one journal to every 51,000 persons; at Madrid, one to 50,000; Venice, one to 11,000; London, one to 10,600; Berlin, one to 1070; Paris, one to 3700; Stockholm, one to 2600; Leipsic, one to 1100.—Taking, instead of cities, kingdoms, the estimate is—in Spain, one journal to 864,000 individuals; in Russia, one to 674,000; in Austria, one to 376,000; in Switzerland, one to 66,000; in France, one to 52,000; in England, one to 46,000; in Holland, one to 40,450; in Prussia, one to 43,000. Comparing the number of subscribers with the population, the proportion is, in France, as 1 to 437; in England, as 1 to 184; in Holland, as 1 to 100.

The number of clergymen employed on foreign missions, by the different evangelical societies in Europe, is 777. Of these 270 are in the West Indies; 36 in West Africa; 3 in East Africa; 115 in South Africa; 2 in African Islands; 7 in countries on the Mediterranean; 251 in India and Ceylon; 10 in Farther India; 3 among the American Indians, and 80 in Polynesia. The number of communicants connected with the missions is 139,974; scholars, 99,297; assistant missionaries, 119; native assistants, 1,763.

The number of clergymen now employed in foreign missions, by the different societies in the United States, is 282. Of these, 35 are among the Indian tribes; 40 in Texas; 36 in Africa; 42 in countries on the Mediterranean; 55 in India; 37 in Farther India; 25 in Polynesia; 14 in Europe, and 1 in South America. The number of native communicants connected with these missions is 33,259; scholars, 32,915; assistant missionaries, 62, and native assistants, 226.

## QUARTERLY LIST.

## DEATHS.

JOHN ARMSTRONG, Columbus, Tenn., Sept. 15, aged 45.  
 ISAAC BOYNTON, Jr., East Harrington, Me., Oct. 28.  
 ABEL BROWN, Canandaigua, N. Y., Nov. 8.  
 WILSON CONNER, Georgia, June 30.  
 A. G. CURRY, Kentucky, Aug. 20, aged 29.  
 ABRAHAM ENNIS, East Mendon, Mon. Co., N. Y., Sept. 24, aged 52.  
 ELBA FULLER, Laona, Chaut. Co., N. Y., Oct. 16, aged 26.  
 JONATHAN GOING, D. D., Granville, Ohio, Nov. 9.  
 ELIAS HARMAN, Aurora, Cayu. Co., N. Y., Aug. 7, aged 70.  
 LEMUEL G. HATCHER, Louis Co., Mo., Aug. 7, aged 32.  
 H. W. HODGES, Catahoula Par., La., Nov. 16, 1843, aged 50.  
 AZEL L. KNAFF, New Hope, Lincoln Co., Mo., Aug. 16.  
 A. L. MASON, Mason, N. H., Oct. 9, aged 32.  
 EZRA MINER, Lempster, N. H., Aug. 18, aged 78.  
 JONATHAN MINER, Stark Co., Ill., Aug. 26.  
 Prof. Z. B. NEWMAN, Upper Alton, Ill., July.  
 WILLIS NEY, (licentiate,) Eaton, Madison Co., N. Y., Sept. 16, aged 22.  
 JAMES A. PAYNE, Fauquier Co., Va., Jan. 25, aged 27.  
 HIRAM SAFFORD, Burlington, Vt., July 28, aged 53.  
 JOHN SEAVEY, Limington, Me., Sept. 2, aged 69.  
 DAVID THOMSON, Smithfield, N. C., Sept. 2, aged 52.

## ORDINATIONS.

RICHARD AMSDEN, Waitafield, Vt., Oct. 3.  
 JOHN ATOWAY, Talbotten, Ga., Aug. 3.  
 DAVID BEECHER, Hebron, N. Y., Sept. 11.  
 JOSEPH BELDON, Freehold, N. J., Aug. 27.  
 JOHN BRIDGES, Thurlow, U. C., July 24.  
 B. S. F. CAKE, Harmony, Monroe Co., O., Oct. 30.  
 GEORGE W. CATE, Barre, Mass., Sept. 25.  
 JOHN K. CHASE, Milton Mills, N. H., Oct. 16.  
 WILLIAM C. CHILD, Charlestown, Ms., Oct. 30.  
 NELSON CRANDALL, Preston, Chen., Co., N. Y., Sept. 28.  
 HERVEY S. DALE, Newport, Wash. Co., O., Oct. 19.  
 HENRY M. DANIEL, Shiloh, Prince George Co., Va., Sept. 20.  
 I. V. DEWITT, Cooperstown, N. Y., Sept. 24.  
 LEWIS DOWNING, Flint, Cherokee Ter., Aug. 4.  
 BENJAMIN FOLLETT, Avon, Me., Aug. 29.  
 WILLIAM W. GARDNER, Shelbyville, Ky., Sept.  
 THOMAS S. GRIFFITHS, Red Bank, Monmouth Co., N. J., Aug. 21.  
 NORMAN HARRIS, Becket, Mass., Oct. 9.  
 JOSEPH C. HARTSHORN, Georgetown, Mass., Oct. 9.  
 PLEASANT HENDERSON, Canton Co., Tenn., Oct. 14.  
 CHARLES W. HEWES, Lonsdale, R. I., Aug. 19.  
 JAMES INGLIS, Detroit, Mich., Oct. 30.  
 R. K. JORDAN, Neville, Clermont Co., O., Oct. 13.  
 SAMUEL S. KINGSLEY, Plainfield, Mass., Aug. 30.  
 RUFUS K. MILLS, Saybrook, Conn., Aug. 23.

J. H. MORRISON, Holland Patent, N. Y., Oct. 9.  
 LEVI MORSE, Athens, Bradford Co., Pa., Oct. 9.  
 J. A. NASH, Watertown, N. Y., Sept. 19.  
 N. M. PERKINS, Westfield, Mass., Nov. 20.  
 R. R. PRENTICE, Norwich, N. Y., Sept. 4.  
 WILLIAM ROBERTS, Delaware, Jersey Co., Ill., July 24.  
 RUTHERFORD RUSSELL, Montville, Conn., June 26.  
 ADONIRAM JUDSON SEDWICK, Lowell, Wash. Co., O., Sept. 8.  
 JAMES J. SLEDGE, Gardner chh., Warren Co., N. C., Oct. 31.  
 WILLIAM J. SMITH, Horricon, N. Y., Sept. 3.  
 RICHARD THORNTON, Mt. Gilead, Randolph Co., Ga., Sept. 15.  
 JOHN TODD, Mannahawkui, N. J., Aug. 23.  
 RIAL TOWER, Leroy, Susq. Co., Pa., Aug. 22.  
 MARSHALL B. TRUE, Amherst, Erie Co., N. Y., Aug. 27.  
 WILLARD P. UPHAM, Taquoe, Cherokee Nation, Oct. 14.  
 L. WARRINER, Smyrna, Chen. Co., N. Y., Sept. 18.  
 JOHN G. WHITNEY, Hebron, N. Y., Sept. 11.  
 WILLIAM A. WHITSITT, Concord, Davidson Co., Tenn., July.  
 ELIJAH L. WILLIAMS, Shiloh, King George Co., Va., Sept. 2.  
 WORDEN, Barry, Pike Co., Ill.  
 JOHN YOUNG, Unity, O., Oct. 17.

## CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

Paw-Paw, Van Buren Co., Mich., July 8.  
 Hillsdale, Mich., July 9.  
 North Lansing, Tomp. Co., N. Y., July 10.  
 Cumb. Mount., Decatur, Tenn., July 15.  
 Smithville, Lawrence Co., Ark., July 20.  
 Hurricane Grove, near Shelbyville, Tenn., July 30.  
 Milford, Page Co., Va., July.  
 Red Bank, Monmouth Co., N. J., Aug. 7.  
 Rockville, Musk. Co., O., Aug. 13.  
 Stetson, Me., Aug. 20.  
 Port Huron, Ark., Aug. 23.  
 Yellville, Marion Co., Ark.  
 Clark Co., Ga., Sept. 3.  
 Carnarvon, Berk's Co., Pa., Sept. 4.  
 Waterville, Me., 2d chh., Sept. 12.  
 Lury, Page Co., Va., Sept. 17.  
 Clerk Co., Ga., Oct. 3.  
 Haarlem, N. Y., Oct. 10.  
 New Leatherwood, M. H., Va., Oct. 12.  
 Pedigo, M. H., Va., Oct. 15.  
 Copp's Mills, Liberty, Me.,  
 Gardner chh., Warren Co., N. C., Oct. 30.  
 Enon chh., Warren Co., N. C., Nov. 3.  
 East Boston, Mass., Nov. 7.

## DEDICATIONS.

Gill's Grove, Chesterfield Co., Va., Aug. 25.  
 Cape Neddock, Me., Aug. 28.  
 West Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 19.  
 Marcy, N. Y., Sept. 25.  
 Southwark, Phila., Penn., Sept. 29.  
 Delhi, Del. Co., N. Y., Sept.  
 South Woodstock, Conn., Oct. 3.  
 Cumberland Hill, R. I., Oct. 8.  
 Bloomingdale, N. Y. City, Oct. 17.  
 Baltimore, Md., Oct. 20.  
 Calais, Me., Oct. 24.  
 Greenwich, Cumb. Co., N. J., Nov. 9.  
 Beverly Farms, Mass., Nov. 21.  
 Moscow, Liv. Co., N. Y., Nov. 21.



# INDEX

TO

## CHRISTIAN REVIEW...VOL. IX.

- A.
- Abrahamic*, Covenant, 457.  
*Ayla*, meaning of, 519.  
*Ancient History*, 316.  
*Apocalypse*, Hinton on the, 621.  
*Apostolic Baptism*, 217; commission, 502.
- B.
- Babylon*, Description of, 176; Prophecies of its Overthrow, 177.  
*Banvard*, his Gems from Flavel, 146.  
*Baptism*, by Transmontanus, 631; guide to 631; by Pengilly, 631; Hinton's history of, 631.  
*Baptism*, Apostolic, 217; Household, 221, 525; not a substitute for circumcision, 462, 513.  
*Baptists*, Statistics of, 39.  
*Believing wife*, sanctified to the Husband, 518.  
*Benevolent Societies*, 317.  
*Biblical Literature*, Townley's Illustrations of, 256.  
*Bolles*, Rev. Dr., Funeral Sermon for, 139.  
*Book that will suit you*, 631.  
*Böttiger's Letters to Müller*, 613.  
*Buddicom's Emmanuel*, 474.  
*Bullions*, Rev. Dr., his Grammars, 622.  
*Burkitt's Notes on the N. T.*, 315.  
*Bush*, on Daniel, 621.  
*Butler's Works*, 199; analysis of a Sermon by, 212.
- C.
- Chalmers' Sermons*, 310.  
*Charitable Contributions*, divine method of, 583; Foundations at Göttingen and Leipsic, 616.  
*Charlotte Elizabeth's Works*, 629.  
*Chase*, Prof., his remarks on Daniel, 144.  
*Christ*, the only Foundation, 157.  
*Christianity*, Moral Forces of, 325.  
*Church Discipline*, 146, 416; Singing, Notices on, 276; Views of Edwards on proper members of a, 484.  
*Church*, without a Bishop, Coleman's 149.
- Ciceronian*, 314.  
*Colporteurs*, 82.  
*Colquhoun Lady*, on the World's Religion, 632.  
*1st Cor. 7: 14*, interpretation of, 518.  
*Crosby*, Prof., his Greek Grammar and Xenophon, 150.  
*Cypress Wreath*, 313.
- D.
- Daily Manna*, 313.  
*Daniel*, Interpretations of, 621.  
*Davidson's Connection of Sacred and Profane History*, 626.  
*Demosthenes*, Champlin's, 114.  
*De Wette*, on Ephesians, 468.  
*Dies Ira*, Literature of, 624.  
*Diognetus*, Epistle to, 280.  
*Disciple*, N. T. meaning of, 504.
- E.
- Edwards*, Pres., his View of Baptism, 483, of Church Members, 484.  
*Elton*, Prof., his Remains of Maxcy, 537.  
*English Martyrs*, by Charlotte Elizabeth, 628.  
*Episcopal Claims*, 27; maintained, 472.  
*Ethiopia*, Highlands of, 396; Religion of, 405.  
*Evangelists*, thoughts on, 390, 423.
- F.
- Fervency in Religion*, 37.  
*Follen*, Life of, 316.  
*Forster*, George, incidents in his life, 619; evangelical letter of, 618.  
*Foster*, Rev. John, his Christian Morals, 473.  
*Fourth Kingdom of Daniel*, 621.  
*Fritzsche*, his Ephesians, 469.
- G.
- Genuineness of the Gospels*, Norton on, 147.  
*German Universities*, Statistics of, 475.  
*Gesenius*, his Hebrew Lexicon, 142.  
*Graham*, Mrs. Isabella, Life of, 313.  
*Great Awakening*, 372.

- Greek Grammar*, Bullions', 622; Crosby's, 151; Kähler's, 623.  
Metres, by Beck and Felton, 625.  
*Gresley on Preaching*, 140.
- H.
- Hall's Contemplations on Scripture History*, 632.  
*Harris*, Rev. J., his Miscellanies, 632.  
*Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland*, 624.  
*Heyne's estimate of several German Scholars*, 616.  
*Hinton on the Prophecies*, 621.  
*Historical Question Book*, Ripley's, 629.  
*Horace*, Hindorf's, 466.  
*Horne's Introduction*, 141.  
*Household Baptisms*, 221, 525.  
*Howell's Terms of Communion*, 631.  
*Huber*, Victor, A. youth of, 620.  
*Hymns*, English, 279; French, 277.
- I.
- Ignorance of the Clergy*, 271.  
*Illustration*, power of, 357.  
*Infant Baptism*, 379; Church Membership, 445, 481; untenable from Christ's treatment of little children, 481; from the apostolic commission, 502; from the nature of Christianity, 526; from Rom. 11: 23, 24, 524; from 1 Cor. 7: 14, 518; from household baptisms, 221, 525; from the analogy of circumcision, 462, 513; nature and degree of, 529.  
*Infidelity*, thoughts on, 199.  
*Inspiration*, Woods on, 1; Gausson on, 1.  
*Interpretation*, Errors in, 599.  
*Isaiah*, Translations from, 178.
- J.
- John 14: 6,—11*, Interpretation of, 567.
- L.
- Learned Ladies*, 274.  
*Literary Intelligence*, 153, 319, 475.  
*Literature*, Conservative Principle in, 624.  
*Lyra Apostolica*, 311.
- M.
- Μαθητῶν*, meaning of 506; *μαθητῆς*, 504.  
*Marot*, Clement, Metres of, 277.  
*Mason on the Church*, 524.  
*Mason*, Rev. F., on Perfection, 232.  
*Matt. 28: 18—20*, Interpretation of, 502.  
*Maxcy*, Pres., Remains of, 537.  
*Methodist Book Concern*, 78.  
*Mexico*, Prescott's Conquest of, 41.  
*Missions*, Baptist, Statistics of, 317.  
*Müller*, John von, Letters to, 609.
- N.
- Neander on Use of the Scriptures*, 127.  
*Newspapers*, Statistics of, 76.  
*Newton's Works*, 310.
- O.
- Οἶκος* and *Οἶκλα*, 221.
- Ordination*, 425.  
*Ouseley's Old Christianity*, 471.  
*Owen*, on the Forgiveness of Sin, 473.
- P.
- Palmer*, Rev. A. G., his Discourse, 313.  
*Pastors*, Rights of, 431.  
*Peck*, Rev. G., his Scripture Rule of Faith, 145.  
*Perfection*, Scriptural View of, 232.  
*Phillips' Mineralogy*, 470.  
*Plutarch*, on the Delay of Punishment, 140, 551.  
Catalogue of his Moral Writings, 552.  
*Pope*, Trial of the, 141.  
*Popery*, Spirit of, 628.  
*Prescott*, his Conquest of Mexico, 41.  
*Press*, Power of the, 70.  
*Prophecy*, Distinctness of, 173.  
*Providence*, Illustrations of, 298.
- R.
- Resentment*, Butler on, 212.  
*Revivals of Religion*, Thoughts on, 385.  
*Richmond*, Rev. Legh, Memoir of, 313.  
*Ripley*, Prof. on the Acts, 146.  
*Robinson*, his Hebrew Lexicon, 142.
- S.
- Satan*, Personality of, 349.  
*Scriptures*, prohibited to the common people, 267; Right use of the, 127; highly valued, 266.  
*Second Adventism*, 597.  
*Sharp*, Rev. Dr., his Sermon, 139.  
*Simcoe*, his Military Journal, 144.  
*Smith*, Rev. John, his Lectures, 471.  
*Smith*, Mrs. S. L., Memoir of, 312.  
*South's Sermons*, 314; anecdote of 315.  
*Sparks' Life of Franklin*, 474.  
*State Debts*, 93.  
*Sternhold & Hopkins*, hymn book of, 279.  
*Stillings*, Henry, Life of, 290.  
*Synopsis of Missions*, 473.  
*Systematic Benevolence*, 583.
- T.
- Tappan's Daughter of the Isles*, 313.  
*Taylor*, Rev. J., on Episcopacy, 472.  
*Tholuck*, on the Psalms, 151; on John, 622.  
*Τοιοῦτος*, meaning of, 493.  
*Tradition*, 145.
- U.
- Unique*, the, 312.  
*Versions*, of the Scriptures, Catalogue of, 258.  
*Virgil*, Anthon's, 150; Peerlkamp's, 624.
- W.
- Walker*, Rev. W., his Church Discipline, 146, 416.  
*Whately's Kingdom of Christ*, 21.  
*Williams*, Rev. W. R., his Address, 624.  
*World's Religion*, the, 632.
- X.
- Xenophon's Anabasis*, Prof. Crosby's, 150.

